"IMAGINE YOU ARE…": HISTORICAL EMPATHY AND U.S. HISTORY

TEXTBOOK ACTIVITIES

A Dissertation

by

LAUREN GAIL SANTARELLI

Submitted to the Graduate and Professional School of
Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Chair of Committee,	Lynn M. Burlbaw
Committee Members,	James Laub
	Sharon Matthews
	Daniel L. Schwartz
Head of Department,	Claire Katz

August 2022

Curriculum and Instruction

ABSTRACT

This study employed a qualitative content analysis design to examine the extent to which 8th and 11th-grade U.S. History textbooks, adopted by the State of Texas, foster historical empathy and disciplinary knowledge and skills in the subject of history through student engagement with textbook activities. The textbook activities collected for this study were those that specifically required students to respond in the voice, or from the perspective, of a historical figure or actor. A total of 744 activities were collected from a sample of 21 Texas adopted 8th or 11th-grade U.S. History textbooks. The activities were collected from different types of prompts, including those in section and unit assessments, unit and section previews, section comprehension or reading checks, and those associated with maps, charts, images, and supplementary text-based sources.

The activities were analyzed according to two analytical frameworks established within existing scholarship related to historical empathy and disciplined historical inquiry. To ensure the reliability of the coding scheme and the overall analytical process, an expert coder was consulted. The researcher and the expert coder meet frequently over the span of a fourth-month period to code the activities and to maintain a one hundred percent inter-coder agreement.

The results of the analysis revealed that students have few opportunities to learn and demonstrate both higher levels of historical empathy and historical knowledge if they engage with historical empathy textbook activities. Out of the 744 activities collected for this study, 686 required students to make generalized, stereotypical, and

unsubstantiated conclusions about the perspectives of historical actors or groups.

Additionally, of the 744 activities, 653 required students to solely rely on historical

content knowledge to respond to the prompts. The historical content knowledge that

students were predominantly encouraged to utilize was that required the simple

repeating, recalling, or reformatting of information about a historical event or figure. As

a result, teachers should not rely on historical empathy textbook activities as

opportunities for students to develop and practice both historical empathy and historical

knowledge, as their students will have limited opportunities to do so if they engage with

the identified prompts.

DEDICATION

I dedicate this dissertation to my mother, Sara Andrews. Without your endless support this journey would not have been possible.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

biggest cheerleaders. I am especially grateful to my mother, Sara Andrews. My mother

has always been a beacon of inspiration and hope in my life. I aspire to be more like her

every day, and I am constantly amazed by her unending love and support.

CONTRIBUTORS AND FUNDING SOURCES

Contributors

This work was supervised by a dissertation committee consisting of Professors Lynn M. Burlbaw [committee chair], James Laub, and Sharon Matthews of the Department of Teaching, Learning, and Culture, and Professor Daniel L. Schwartz of the Department of History.

Funding Sources

Graduate study was made possible in part by assistantships offered from the Department of Teaching, Learning, and Culture of Texas A&M University.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The teaching of history in public schools is often controversial among various U.S. education stakeholders. Students, teachers, parents, researchers, educational organizations, and politicians, each have strong opinions about how and why history is taught in schools (Barton & Levstik, 2004; Evans, 2004). As a result, the teaching of history is advertised to fulfill a wide variety of purposes, such as developing national identity and patriotism, elevating traditionally marginalized voices, preparing future generations of citizens for civic participation, and building foundational skills surrounding the nature of historical scholarship (Barton & Levstik, 2004; Evans, 2004; Levstik & Barton, 2015; Saye & Brush, 2004).

Although these purposes are "valid" and are often present in history instruction, support for teaching historical inquiry has increased over the past two decades (Barton & Levstik, 2004; Levstik & Barton, 2015; Saye & Brush, 2004; VanSledright, 2014; Wineburg, 1999). Historical inquiry is the process that practitioners of historical research use to make sense of the past. Therefore, historical inquiry requires skills such as asking questions, gathering and organizing source material, evaluating source material, settling conflicting accounts, and using evidence to defend accounts of past events (Levstik & Barton, 2015; VanSledright, 2014). Advocates of utilizing a historical inquiry approach to history education argue that students benefit by building up a foundational knowledge of the discipline and thereby become more prepared to fulfill the responsibilities of civic life in a democratic society (Barton & Levstik, 2004; Levstik & Barton, 2015;

VanSledright, 2004). Students who learn how to gather information, analyze multiple historical perspectives, and make evidence-based arguments, for example, are better able to evaluate the perspectives and arguments surrounding social issues they may encounter in their everyday lives (Saye & Brush, 2004; VanSledright, 2004).

Historical empathy is an important component of historical inquiry that further assists students in developing the skills needed for democratic citizenship. Historical empathy is defined in several ways but generally involves understanding "how people from the past thought, felt, made decisions, acted and faced consequences within specific historical and social contexts" (Endacott & Brooks, 2013, p. 41). The development of historical empathy is crucial for students preparing for civic competency because the information and experiences gained from empathizing with past perspectives can contribute toward student development of knowledge and tolerance of social events, issues, and viewpoints (Ashby & Lee, 1987; Barton & Levstik, 2004; Endacott, 2014; Kohlmeier, 2006).

Although historical empathy offers students powerful skills and benefits, little is known regarding how curricular materials, such as textbooks, foster its development. Understanding how textbooks cultivate historical empathy is essential as textbooks are among the most common curricular materials available to students. Even though history textbooks have been heavily criticized for many reasons, such as offering limited perspectives, lacking depth, and oversimplifying social controversies (see Foster, Morris, & Davis, 1996; Lavere, 2008; Lowen, 2018; Wineburg, 1991), they are still considered one of the most widely used instructional materials (Lucy, Demszky, Bromley, &

2

Jurafsky, 2020) despite the availability of other technological resources (Pearcy, 2019). According to the American Textbook Council, textbooks have long served as the "draft horse" of social studies curriculum in the United States, as they typically provide teachers with an "organized sequence" of content, a variety of student activities and assessments, and an efficient way to save both time and energy during the planning process (Sewall, 2000, p. 3). Additionally, textbooks also typically represent the "intended curriculum" that is established and assessed by either national or state-based educational organizations (Apple, & Christian-Smith, 1991). As a result, textbooks frequently dominate what content the students learn in various school subjects, as they outline particular topics, events, figures, perspectives, and even social and cultural values (Lucy, Demszky, Bromley, & Jurafsky, 2020).

Problem Statement

The teaching of historical empathy, and the disciplinary knowledge and skills accompanying it, are critical as they offer students the opportunity to build foundational knowledge and skills surrounding the subject of history and to prepare for the responsibilities of democratic citizenship. Therefore, the question then arises, where do students learn historical empathy, and what materials and circumstances cultivate it?

The research previously conducted around this topic offers important considerations for the present study. Currently, only a handful of inquiries analyze how textbooks encourage students to develop historical empathy. Of the available literature, Donnelly and Sharp (2020), Lazarakou (2008), Morgan (2015), and Vogel (2020) each indicate that history textbooks have the potential to foster the development of historical

empathy. Of these authors, Morgan noted that textbooks could encourage students to display historical empathy if they provide multiple perspectives and primary sources, while Donnelly and Sharp, Lazarakou, and Vogel each indicate that historical empathy can be encouraged through student engagement with textbook activities.

Although each author reveals that historical empathy can, to some degree, be fostered by utilizing history textbooks, their findings are restricted to South African (Morgan, 2015), Greek (Lazarakou, 2008), and Australian (Donnelly & Sharp, 2020; Vogel, 2020) history textbooks respectively. Currently, only Yeager et al.'s (1998) work examines how students utilize U.S history textbooks to understand the perspectives of historical figures. Yeager et al. (1998) found that the textbook utilized in their study contained limited historical contextual information, which ultimately diminished the ability of students to empathize with historical figures. Yeager et al. offer important insights for social studies researchers, but their conclusions are based upon students' experiences with the text contained in a single U.S. history textbook. As a result, more comprehensive research that moves beyond the content information in a single history textbook is needed. More information regarding the extent to which U.S. History textbooks foster the development of historical empathy is likely to be understood by addressing this gap in the available literature.

Additionally, none of the studies outlined above report the disciplinary knowledge and skills needed to respond to the textbook prompts. Understanding which knowledge and skills are targeted by these questions is important, because in order for students to conceptualize how historical figures "thought, felt, made decisions, acted,

and faced consequences within a specific historical context" (Endacott & Brooks, 2013, p. 14), they must use knowledge carefully acquired from examining historical evidence. As a result, a student's ability to engage in historical empathy is rooted in historical inquiry and depends on disciplinary skills, knowledge, and reasoning over available evidence.

Purpose of the Study

The primary purpose of this study was to expand upon the existing knowledge concerning the teaching and learning of history. More specifically, this study sought to extend the research concerning the development of historical empathy and disciplinary knowledge and skills through student engagement with history textbooks. As a result, this project explored how textbook activities in U.S. History textbooks encourage both historical empathy and the use of disciplinary knowledge and skills. In this way, the current study aimed to supplement previous inquiries concerning this topic, which only focus on the development of historical empathy within a limited number of international textbooks, or evaluate how students use one U.S. history textbook to empathize with a single historical figure.

Research Questions

The research questions guiding this study are as follows,

- To what extent do textbook activities in 8th and 11th grade U.S. History textbooks, adopted by the State of Texas, foster historical empathy?

- What disciplinary knowledge and skills are students required to learn or demonstrate to complete textbook activities designed to foster historical empathy?

The textbooks examined for this study were only those used in 8th and 11th grade U.S. History courses in Texas. While the development of historical empathy may occur in other Texas social studies courses, I limited the study to 8th and 11th grades because those are the only courses above 8th grade that all students are required to take that consist of a more detailed and substantive coverage of content (Texas Education Agency, 2018).

Overview of the Study

This study utilized a qualitative content analysis design to examine how 8th and 11th grade U.S. History textbooks, adopted by the State of Texas, foster historical empathy and disciplinary knowledge and skills through student engagement with textbook activities. Content analyses are commonly used in educational research to investigate the content contained in curricular materials or resources (Colbert-Lewis, 2005; Frankel, Wallen & Hyun, 2015; Korin, 2008, Lucy et al., 2020; Stanford, 2016; Vanderhook, 2020). A content analysis design was selected for this study to examine the language and meaning communicated by historical empathy textbook activities regarding the development of historical empathy and historical knowledge.

The data collected for this study consists of historical empathy textbook activities. A historical empathy textbook activity is "any prompt" in the textbook "that students are expected to do, beyond getting input solely from reading or listening," that

specifically asks the student to "respond in the voice, or perspective of a historical actor" (Brophy & Alleman, 1991, p. 9; Donnelly & Sharp, 2020, p. 97). Each of the textbook activities were collected from a purposefully selected sample of twenty-one 8th or 11th-grade U.S. History textbooks. Within the sample of textbooks, the historical empathy activities were collected from different types of prompts, including those in section and unit assessments, unit and section previews, section comprehension or reading checks, and those associated with maps, charts, images, and supplementary text-based sources. In total, 744 historical empathy activities were collected for this study.

The historical empathy activities were then analyzed according to both Ashby and Lee's (1987) Five Levels of Historical Empathy Framework and VanSledright's (2104) Historical Thinking and Understanding Framework to determine how the sample of textbooks cultivate historical empathy and historical knowledge. To ensure reliability, an expert coder was consulted to both code and analyze the historical empathy textbook activities.

Significance of the Study

History textbooks continue to be among the most widely used instructional materials in the social studies classroom, despite decades worth of criticism (Lucy, Demszky, Bromley, & Jurafsky, 2020). Because of this continued use, research examining how textbooks encourage the development of historical empathy and knowledge must continue. Cultivating these skills is crucial in social studies education as they are likely to offer students various benefits. By trying to understand how historical figures "thought, felt, made decisions, acted, and faced consequences within a specific

historical context" (Endacott & Brooks, 2013, p. 41), students benefit educationally and civically. Students who practice gathering, contextualizing, and juxtaposing different pieces of information regarding historical perspectives, for example, learn foundational skills associated with the subject of history and how to both understand and tolerate perspectives that are different from their own. By developing these skills, students are better prepared to fulfill the responsibilities associated with democratic citizenship, such as making rational and informed decisions regarding multi-logical and multi-variable social issues (Saye & Brush, 2004; VanSledright, 2004).

The current study is significant because it continues to contribute information regarding how textbooks encourage the development of historical empathy and knowledge. This study intends to further expand upon the research previously conducted on this topic by examining how U.S. History textbook activities foster these skills. Therefore, the findings that result from this study can help teachers make better informed curricular decisions and can offer textbook publishers ways to improve activities so that they better assist students in building foundational skills and preparing for the responsibilities associated with democratic citizenship.

Definitions

The following definitions indicate the meanings these terms held within the context of the current study.

- Historical Empathy - The understanding of how historical figures "thought, felt, made decisions, acted, and faced consequences within a specific historical and social context" (Endacott & Brooks, 2013, p. 41).

- Historical Inquiry - The knowledge and skills that practitioners of historical research use to make sense of the past. Procedures consist of forming questions about the past, gathering and organizing source material, evaluating source material, and using evidence to assemble and defend an account of past events (VanSledright, 2014).

- Textbook Activity - "Any prompt" within the textbook "that students are expected to do, beyond getting input solely from reading or listening, to learn, practice, apply, evaluate, or in any other way respond to curricular content" (Brophy & Alleman, 1991, p. 9).

- Historical Empathy Textbook Activity - Textbook activities that prompt students "to respond in the voice, or perspective of a historical actor or group" (Donnelly & Sharp, 2020, p. 97).

Summary and Organization of the Dissertation

This chapter discussed the purpose of the current study and its overall significance to the teaching and learning of history. This chapter argues that if history textbooks continue to be widely used by social studies teachers, then research examining how textbooks encourage the development of historical empathy and knowledge must continue. Examining the development of these skills through student textbook use is paramount, as they often offer students both educational and civic benefits. Students who have practice gathering and juxtaposing different pieces of information and analyzing multiple historical perspectives, for example, learn foundational skills associated with the subject of history and how to make rational and informed decisions

regarding social issues they may experiences throughout their lives (Saye & Brush, 2004; VanSledright, 2004).

This study examined how textbooks foster the development of historical empathy and knowledge by examining textbook activities in U.S. history textbooks. Therefore, this project builds upon previous inquiries that either largely examine how historical empathy is cultivated in textbooks used in different countries, such as South Africa, Greece, and Australia, or narrowly evaluate how students use one U.S. history textbook to empathize with a single historical figure.

The following chapters in this dissertation expand upon the information provided in chapter one. Chapter two explores the research literature that served as the foundation for this study. Included in chapter two is a review of both the theoretical and experimental studies concerning the development of historical empathy by students.

The third chapter expands upon the overview presented in chapter one by further explaining the design and procedures associated with the study. Chapter three discusses how each historical empathy textbook activity was collected, coded, and analyzed, and how the study's reliability was ensured. Additionally, chapter three provides and discusses examples of historical empathy activities that represent the various coding categories.

The fourth chapter reports the study's main findings and includes a presentation of the relevant data as it relates to the research questions guiding this inquiry.

The fifth chapter presents a discussion of the study's findings and analyzes them further within the context of literature discussed in chapter two. Recommendations for future research concerning this topic and conclusions are also provided in chapter five.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

This study aimed to examine how 8th and 11th grade U.S. History textbooks, adopted for use in the State of Texas, foster historical empathy and historical knowledge through student engagement with textbook activities. Towards this end, the following research questions were posed:

- To what extent do textbook activities in 8th and 11th grade U.S. History textbooks, adopted by the State of Texas, foster historical empathy?

- What disciplinary knowledge and skills are students required to learn or demonstrate to complete textbook activities designed to foster historical empathy?

This chapter explores the literature that served as the foundation for this study by providing a synthesis of the theoretical and experimental inquiries concerning historical empathy and historical knowledge and skills. This chapter will then conclude with a discussion of the current study's design as it relates to the research literature discussed in this chapter.

Historical Empathy

Defining Historical Empathy

In order to examine the extent to which textbooks encourage the development of historical empathy, it is first of all relevant to define historical empathy. However, defining historical empathy is a challenging task, as there is very little consensus among researchers concerning the meaning of the term (See Brooks, 2009; Endacott & Brooks,

2018; Yilmaz, 2007). Over the past five decades of scholarship on this subject, authors have provided several competing interpretations of the construct. (See Ashby & Lee, 1987; Barton & Levstik, 2004; Davis, Jr., 2001; Endacott, 2010; Endacott & Brooks, 2018; Foster & Yeager, 1998; Foster, 1999).

Due to these competing interpretations, some researchers have attempted to define historical empathy by more broadly defining the term empathy. In this attempt to define empathy, some scholars have largely pulled from discussions about the term within the field of psychology (Endacott & Brooks, 2013; Foster, 2001). However, the attempt to define historical empathy through a psychological lens has also been controversial as some scholars view the two terms as being inherently different (Endacott & Brooks, 2013; Foster, 2001). Social studies educators, for example, tend to argue that a psychological definition of empathy is concerned with empathizing with contemporaries, while historical empathy is concerned with empathizing with people from the past who had different values or utilized different ways of thinking depending on their historical and social contexts (Endacott & Brooks, 2013, Foster, 2001; Maxlow, 2015).

The Cognitive Construct of Historical Empathy

Much of the debate concerning historical empathy centers around whether or not both cognitive and affective dimensions of understanding play a role in its development. Many early researchers exploring this topic characterize historical empathy primarily as a cognitive construct (Ashby & Lee, 1987, 2001; Davis, 2001; Foster, 1999, 2001; VanSledright, 2001; Yeager & Foster, 2001). Building on these early researchers' ideas,

Endacott and Brooks (2013) defined historical empathy as how students come to understand how historical figures "thought, felt, made decisions, acted, and faced consequences within specific historical and social contexts" (p.41). A student's ability to engage in historical empathy, therefore, is rooted in the historical method and is dependent upon a strict adherence to disciplinary reasoning over available evidence (Ashby & Lee, 1987, 2001; Davis, 2001; Foster, 2001; VanSledright, 2001; Yeager & Foster, 2001). Additionally, during the inquiry process, several of the early researchers argue that students should constantly evaluate their own positionalities or emotions surrounding the historical figures or contexts in order to more accurately understand the historical perspectives under examination (Ashby & Lee, 1987, 2001; Foster, 2001; VanSledright, 2001). Failure on the part of the student to either closely examine available evidence or to recognize their own positionalities could potentially contribute to "issues" that are counterintuitive to the development of historical empathy, such as identification, imagination, and sympathy (Foster, 2001; Yeager & Foster, 2001).

Identification occurs when students fail to recognize that they are different from a historical figure and live in a different time period. Identification is an issue in historical scholarship because instead of understanding the historical figure within their own time and space, students often merge their personal values or realities with those of the past (Foster, 2001). Errors in identification result from unexamined perceived relations to the historical figure or a failure to accurately understand the evidence that outlines the historical contexts in which the actor lived.

Imagination occurs when students "make up" inferences or speculations about the past that are unsupported by historical evidence. Errors in imagination similarly result from a failure to understand evidence from the past accurately, but they can also occur if not enough evidence is available to the students (Foster, 2001; Yeager et al., 1998).

Sympathy occurs when students feel bad for or pity the experiences faced by historical figures. Sympathy is not necessarily "bad" for students to experience or engage in during the study of history, but ultimately it is not the central purpose of history. Foster (2001) argues that sympathy toward some historical characters, such as Holocaust victims or enslaved people groups, should be welcomed in the social studies classroom, especially to discuss the impact that specific actions and beliefs had on people in the past. However, Foster asserts that the study of history is more about understanding the events and contexts that shaped the lives and actions of historical figures, rather than "feeling bad about" the experiences that historical figures endured.

The Dual Domain Construct of Historical Empathy

On the other side of the historical empathy debate, more recent research characterizes historical empathy as a "dual-domain" construct, consisting of both cognitive and affective dimensions (Barton & Levstik, 2004; Brooks, 2011; Endacott, 2010, 2014; Endacott & Brooks, 2013, 2018; Endacott & Sturtz, 2015; Kohlmeier, 2006; Roberts, 2019). This dual-domain construct is similar to one that social psychologists have widely accepted within their respective fields but, again, historical empathy is seen as being distinct because of its focus on empathizing with historical figures (Decety &

Jackson, 2006; Endacott & Brooks, 2013, 2018). Under this dual-domain construct, students still use "cognitive tools" such as the critical examination of historical evidence and historical contextualization, but also use affective tools such as "care" or "shared commonalities" to understand how historical figures "thought, felt, made decisions, acted, and faced consequences within specific historical and social contexts" (Endacott & Brooks, 2013 p. 41).

Barton and Levstik (2004) state that "care" is a necessary affective tool in developing historical empathy because it is the "motivating force behind the historical research" (p. 228). Historians, teachers, and students alike, for example, do not expend energy attempting to understand historical perspectives unless they care about the experiences of people from the past. Barton and Levstik argue that there are four types of care in social studies education which they define as "care about, care that, care for, and care to" (p. 229).

Care about relates to a student's interest in the past. Students care about understanding certain historical topics and perspectives. *Care that* is when students care that particular events happened within history. *Care for* is when students want to care for people of the past because they want to provide historical figures with support or assistance. *Care for* is seen as a motivational tool to encourage *care about* and *care that*. If students care for historical figures, they may be more motivated to care about historical events or that historical events happened. *Care for*, however, needs to be closely monitored by students and teachers to avoid potential errors in identification or imagination. Students need to recognize that they are not the historical figure, that they

do not live in the same time period as the historical figure, and that they have not experienced the same events or feelings as the historical figure. *Care to* is when students care to change their own beliefs or behaviors in the present, based on what they learned about the past. *Care to* might not necessarily develop during historical inquiry, but for socio-cultural history educators, it is an important affective tool for students to obtain in order to achieve the "ultimate purpose of history education"; taking informed action in the present (Barton & Levstik, 2004, p. 229).

Teaching Historical Empathy

Research conducted over the past three decades on this topic has provided insight into the conditions that are conducive to promoting historical empathy. The collection of these studies suggests that history educators use various methods and resources to encourage the development of historical empathy. Among these recommendations, however, some consensus has accumulated around "specific practices," which have been identified as "critical attributes of any effort to advance historical empathy" (Endacott & Brooks, 2018, p. 213).

One such "critical attribute" that social studies researchers suggest should be present in each historical empathy learning experience is working with primary sources. Working with primary sources is a necessary component for promoting historical empathy due to its ability to provide students with an idea of how historical figures thought and felt about specific events or situations (Endacott & Brooks, 2018). Among the literature that utilizes primary source work to promote historical empathy, differences regarding source quantity and type are present. Several researchers, for

17

example, suggest utilizing a collection of sources (Brooks, 2008; Doppen, 2000; Endacott, 2010, 2014; Foster, 1999; Yeager et al., 1998), while Kohlmeier (2006) suggests that a single, purposefully selected, source can assist in the promotion of historical empathy. Additionally, some social studies researchers advocate for using a specific type of source, while others suggest using a variety of sources (Doppen, 2000, Foster, 1999, Kohlmeier, 2006; Yeager et al., 1998). Sources that have been utilized to encourage historical empathy consist of first-person narratives (Kohlmeier, 2006), journal entries, letters, speeches (Endacott, 2014; Foster, 1999), historical photographs or visuals (Brooks, 2011; Foster, 1999), statistical or graphic data (Endacott, 2014; Foster, 1999), newspaper articles (Foster, 1999), films (Doppen, 2000; Brown-Buchanan, 2012), and historical artifacts (Uppin & Timostsuk, 2019).

Although working with primary sources is considered to be a "critical attribute of any effort to advance historical empathy" (Endacott & Brooks, 2018, p. 213), previous literature has also revealed that students often struggle to make sense of these historical accounts (Afflerbach & VanSledright, 2001; Barton & Levstik, 2004, Endacott & Brooks, 2018; Wineburg, 1991, 1999, 2001). For example, Wineburg (2001) notes that when students read historical accounts, they often have limited background knowledge of historical events and, therefore, may be less likely to place a historical perspective within its respected historical and social contexts. Furthermore, Wineburg also notes that students often bypass important content within primary sources, such as the information related to who wrote the source, when the source was written, why the source was written, and where the source was written and is going. Other content within primary

18

sources that students often overlook, or stumble on, include antiquated or subtle word choices used by historical actors (Afflerbach & VanSledright, 2001; Wineburg, 2001). The antiquated or subtle word choices that historical actors use can convey further information regarding the perspective that is not directly stated in the source. As a result of these difficulties, students should be provided with teacher or curricular support when reading and interacting with historical accounts.

A second "critical attribute" of a historical empathy learning experience is the inclusion of "discussion-based" instructional methods. Discussion-based instructional methods help promote the development of historical empathy by introducing students to new ideas and expanding student thinking about the historical figure's thoughts, feelings, and actions within various historical and social contexts (Endacott & Brooks, 2018; Kohlmeier, 2006). Various types of discussion-based methods have been used to encourage the development of historical empathy in students, whether they are debates (Jensen, 2008), small groups (Ashby & Lee, 1987; Doppen, 2000; Endacott, 2014), or seminars (Kohlmeier, 2006).

A third "critical attribute" that social studies researchers have identified as promoting historical empathy development is the incorporation of first-person writing assignments. First-person writing assignments allow students to write from the viewpoint of a historical figure. The use of first-person writing assignments has encouraged students to express the feelings and thoughts of a historical figure, but the teacher must closely monitor the students' responses to avoid issues that are

19

counterintuitive to the study of history, such as identification or imagination (Brooks, 2008; D'Adamo, & Fallace, 2011; Endacott, 2010; Endacott & Brooks, 2018).

Controversy Concerning First Person Assignments or Activities

Although first-person writing assignments and activities can encourage students to express the "feelings and thoughts" of a historical figure, their use in the social studies classroom is not without criticism. Social studies researchers associated with the Critical Resources for Elementary Social Studies Teachers (C.R.E.S.S.T) Facebook group have discussed the dangers of using specific first-person perspective taking activities for years, especially as they relate to the topic of teaching about the history of American slavery. Members of the C.R.E.S.S.T. Facebook group encourage teachers to approach first person activities with caution as certain perspectives are considered inappropriate to ask students to assume. Inappropriate perspective-taking activities are those that either center on reenacting or romanticizing oppression or that appropriate or trivialize cultural traditions or religious practices that others deem sacred. Engaging in these types of activities is discouraged as they can cause students to experience unnecessary trauma in the classroom (Levstik & Barton, in press, p. 4).

Historical Empathy and History Textbooks

Despite over three decades worth of scholarship on historical empathy, only a handful of studies examine the role that textbooks play in its development. Currently, only Donnelly and Sharp (2020), Lazarakou (2008), Morgan (2015), Vogel (2020), and Yeager et al (1998) provide insight into the role that textbooks play in the promotion of historical empathy. In the studies conducted by Donnelly and Sharp, Lazarakou,

Morgan, and Vogel, each author examined the influence of textbooks on historical

empathy development by focusing on whether or not textbook content was conducive to

fostering historical empathy. The specific content that many of these studies examined

includes the textbooks' sources, perspectives, and activities. Of these authors, Morgan's

(2015) study predominantly focused on how sources and perspectives present within

South African history textbooks encourage historical empathy. Morgan argues that

textbooks are likely to promote historical empathy if they provide multiple perspectives,

primary narratives, and sources surrounding historical events. In this study, Morgan

analyzed chapters discussing the topic of Nazi Germany contained in six different

textbooks and found that only one textbook could mediate the development of historical

empathy. The textbook that was able to cultivate historical empathy relied heavily on

primary sources to convey information about the historical event, presented different

perspectives from people with diverse backgrounds, and related historical actors' choices

to students' lives. However, Morgan found that most textbooks provided limited

perspectives and contextual information.

Lazarakou (2008) similarly sought to understand how textbook content mediates

the development of historical empathy in students. However, instead of examining South

African history textbooks, Lazarakou assessed whether or not the Greek history

curriculum and an associated textbook encouraged students to develop historical

empathy. Lazarakou determined that textbooks could encourage the development of

historical empathy if they contained "issues that lend themselves to empathetic analysis"

(p. 32). "Issues that lend themselves to empathetic analysis" are those in which a conflict

of ideas, attitudes, interests, or actions exists among historical people groups (p. 32). Lazarakou found that several opportunities exist for students to develop historical empathy, specifically in the form of textbook activities. Lazarakou notes that although textbook activities encouraged historical empathy, many of them were largely unsupported by historical materials or the content within the text.

Other studies that examine how textbooks foster the development of historical empathy were those conducted by Vogel (2020) and Donnelly and Sharp (2020). Vogel, Donnelly, and Sharp analyzed how textbook activities in Australian History textbooks engage students in developing historical empathy. Vogel's (2020) study examined how three common types of historical empathy activities foster historical empathy. The types of historical empathy activities that Vogel examined are those that encourage students to understand the perspective of a particular historical actor, a general historical group, or someone who is removed in time, such as a historian or biographer. In analyzing these activities, Vogel found that they have the potential to encourage the development of historical empathy but that many of them often did not provide students with enough support, context, perspectives, or historical sources to answer the prompt effectively.

Similar to Vogel (2020), Donnelly and Sharp (2020) also examined textbook activities designed to foster the development of historical empathy. However, instead of analyzing commonly occurring perspective activities, Donnelly and Sharp expanded their examination to include a wider range of historical empathy activities. In analyzing these activities, Donnelly and Sharp constructed an assessment tool that incorporates Ashby & Lee's Five Levels of Historical Empathy Model (1987) and Biggs and Tang's

(2007) Structure of Observed Learning Outcomes Taxonomy (SOLO). Donnelly and

Sharp argued that more information regarding the types of historical empathy and

cognitive complexity that textbook activities encourage could be obtained through

utilizing this tool. Donnelly and Sharp found that the textbook activities provide

opportunities for students to reach the highest levels of the targeted taxonomies but that

a majority of the activities encourage students to make stereotypical, "unsubstantiated

and ahistorical responses" (p. 92), due to the lack of contextual information or evidence

within the texts.

Of the available literature that examines how textbooks foster the development of

historical empathy, only Yeager et al.'s (1998) work assess how students utilize

textbooks to understand the perspectives of historical figures. In this study, Yeager et al.

compared how two groups of students utilized different sources to understand President

Harry Truman's decision to drop the atomic bombs on the Japanese cities of Hiroshima

and Nagasaki. One group of students was tasked with reading their school's U.S. History

textbook, while the other group was tasked with reading a collection of primary and

secondary sources related to the topic. Yeager et al. found that the students utilizing their

school's history textbook were less likely to develop historical empathy surrounding

Truman's decision to bomb Hiroshima and Nagasaki, Japan. Yeager et al. concluded that

the school's U.S. History textbooks contained limited historical contextual information,

which ultimately hindered the ability of students to draw on a variety of evidence to

support their conclusions about Truman's thoughts, feelings, and actions. As a result,

students within the textbook group either restated facts present in the textbook or fell

prey to the issue of imagination to extend the information they had regarding Truman's decision.

Historical Knowledge & Thinking

In order to understand how historical figures "thought, felt, acted, made decisions, and faced consequences within their specific historical and social contexts", students need an understanding of historical knowledge, and the domain-specific processing skills that accompany it (Endacott & Brooks, 2013 p. 41; VanSledright, 2001). Historical knowledge, and its accompanying skills, have been defined in many ways, but are often interpreted through examining the knowledge and procedures employed by historians to make sense of the past (Seixas & Morton, 2013; VanSledright, 2014; Wineburg, 2001). To make sense of the past, historians have to engage in tasks such as asking questions, gathering and organizing source material, evaluating perspectives, and using evidence to both assemble and defend an account of a historical event or perspective (Brooks, 2010; Levstik & Barton, 2015, Seixas & Morton, 2013; VanSledright, 2014; Wineburg, 1991, 1999, 2001). Therefore, through engaging in these tasks, researchers argue that historians utilize at least two interdependent components of historical knowledge, content knowledge and procedural concepts or skills (Seixas & Morton, 2013; VanSledright, 2014; Wineburg, 1991, 1999, 2001).

The Big Six Historical Concepts Framework for Historical Knowledge

However, differences in what constitutes content knowledge or procedural concepts or skills exist among history education researchers (See Seixas and Morton, 2013; VanSledright, 2014). For example, Seixas and Morton (2013) argue that historical

knowledge is composed of content knowledge and six different overlapping "procedural" concepts. Seixas and Morton find these concepts to be vital for understanding the past, as they provide meaning to historical content that would otherwise be a "series of disconnected bits of data" (p. 4). The six critical concepts for understanding historical content are historical significance, evidence, continuity and change, cause and consequence, historical perspectives, and the "ethical dimension" (p. 4).

Seixas and Morton (2013) conceptualize historical significance as the reasoning and processes historians use to determine "what is important to learn about the past" (p. 10). To determine what is important about the past, Seixas and Morton argue that historians examine past events, people, or developments to see if they result in a change or highlight persisting issues in the past or present. If past events, people, or developments fit these criteria, then Seixas and Morton argue that they are considered to "occupy a meaningful place in a narrative" and are, therefore, significant (p. 10). Although a historical event, person, or development may have significance, Seixas and Morgan also argue that since historical significance is a constructed concept, significance can vary over time and from group to group.

Another critical concept that Seixas and Morton (2013) argue is vital for understanding historical content is the concept of evidence. Evidence is "how historians know what they know about the past" (p. 10). In historical scholarship, evidence is extracted from primary sources that relate to the historical event, person, or development under investigation. Morton and Seixas argue that historians acquire evidence when they

ask questions about primary sources, such as who created the source, when was the source created, why was this source created, and where is this source coming from, referring to, or going. The evidence acquired through the questioning process should then be analyzed in "relation to the context of its historical setting" (p. 10) and corroborated by other sources. After acquiring, analyzing, and corroborating evidence, Seixas and Morton argue that historians then can make interpretations about the historical event, person, or development under study.

A third concept that Seixas and Morton (2013) argue is vital for understanding historical content is the concept of continuity and change. Seixas and Morton view continuity and change as the reasoning and processes that historians utilize to "make sense of the complex flows of history" (p. 10). Seixas and Morton argue that historians often look for change and continuity in historical evidence by constantly asking evaluative questions. Evaluative questions that relate to the concept of change and continuity are those that allow the historian to understand when change is occurring, how fast or slow change is progressing, when change shifts in direction or pace, or when the impact of change results in progress for one, but decline for another.

Seixas and Morton (2013) argue that the concept of cause and consequence is crucial for understanding historical content. Historians utilize the concept of cause and consequence when they are concerned with understanding why historical events happened and how those events impacted society. When determining the causes and consequences of historical events, Seixas and Morton argue that historians tend to understand that there are multiple causes and consequences associated with a historical

event, that causes often vary in influence, and that sometimes consequences are unintended.

The fifth concept is historical perspectives (Seixas and Morton, 2013). Historians utilize the concept of historical perspectives when they are concerned with understanding the people of the past. Seixas and Morton argue that to understand the perspectives of historical actors, historians must have a deep understanding of the context in which the figure lived and must use evidence acquired from historical sources to inform their inferences. Additionally, Seixas and Morgan argue that historians are careful not to identify with historical actors or impose their own present ideas and values to either clarify or rationalize people's actions in the past.

The final concept that Seixas and Morton (2013) argue is essential for understanding the past is the concept of ethical dimensions. Seixas and Morton view the ethical dimension of history as a key factor in helping to assign meaning to past events and situations and to make informed judgments about contemporary issues. When reading about those who "unleashed historical wrongs and their heroic opponents", for example, Seixas and Morton argue it is impossible not to make ethical judgments as their actions have meaning in both the past and the present (p. 170). As a result, Seixas and Morton argue that nearly every historical narrative contains ethical judgments, whether or not they are implied or explicitly stated. In navigating the ethical dimension of history, Seixas and Morton argue that historians tend to take into account the historical context surrounding the actions of historical figures in order to avoid "imposing contemporary standards of right or wrong on the past" (p. 11).

VanSledright's Framework of Historical Thinking & Understanding

In contrast to Seixas and Morton (2013), VanSledright (2014) argues that the "big six concepts of historical knowledge" can be classified as both substantive and strategic historical knowledge. Substantive knowledge consists of "content knowledge," or the "narratives, arguments, and explanations about the past" (p. 40), while strategic knowledge consists of the skills and processes that historians utilize to acquire substantive knowledge.

In VanSledright's framework for historical thinking and understanding, substantive knowledge consists of two smaller domains of knowledge, first-ordered and second-ordered knowledge. First-ordered substantive knowledge consists mostly of "raw" historical data or "facts" that are subject-specific and range in complexity, while second-ordered substantive knowledge consists of the knowledge organized by concepts; the same concepts are outlined by Sexias and Morton (2013). VanSledright argues that the knowledge generated around these concepts can simplify, clarify, and even deepen an understanding of past accounts or events.

In addition to serving as substantive knowledge, VanSledright argues that historical concepts, such as decline and progress, change and continuity, cause and effect, conflict and resolution, historical context, and historical significance (2014), can also serve as strategic knowledge. Strategic knowledge consists of the skills and processes historians utilize to "do history" or to process and understand substantive knowledge. Historical concepts help historians acquire historical knowledge because they help organize and make sense of historical data. Beyond utilizing historical

concepts to process and acquire historical knowledge, VanSledright argues that historians also use specific skills such as analyzing sources, sourcing historical documents, corroborating sources, determining reliability and bias, locating and selecting evidence, and framing the social, political, and economic contexts, to make sense of the past. Therefore, historians attempt to piece together the most precise narrative of past events or perspectives by utilizing these skills.

Gaps in the Existing Literature

The research previously conducted around the topics of historical empathy and historical knowledge offers important considerations for the present study. Currently, only a handful of inquiries analyze how textbook activities provide opportunities for students to develop historical empathy. Of the available literature, Lazarakou (2008), Morgan (2015), Vogel (2020), and Donnelly and Sharp (2020) each indicate that history textbooks have the potential to foster the development of historical empathy. Morgan (2015) noted that textbooks could encourage students to display historical empathy if they provide multiple perspectives and primary sources, while Lazarakou (2008), Vogel (2020), and Donnelly and Sharp (2020) each indicate that historical empathy can be encouraged through student engagement with textbook activities.

Although each author reveals that historical empathy can, to some degree, be fostered by utilizing history textbooks, their findings are restricted to Australian (Donnelly & Sharp, 2020; Vogel, 2020), Greek (Lazarakou, 2008), and South African (Morgan, 2015) history textbooks respectively. Currently, only Yeager et al.'s (1998) work examines how students utilize a single U.S. history textbook to understand the

perspectives of historical figures. Additionally, none of the studies outlined above report the disciplinary knowledge and skills needed to respond to the textbook activity prompts. Understanding which knowledge and skills are targeted by these questions is essential because to conceptualize how historical figures "thought, felt, made decisions, acted, and faced consequences within a specific historical context" (Endacott & Brooks, 2013, p. 41), students must use knowledge carefully acquired from examining historical evidence.

This study seeks to bridge these gaps in the literature by examining the extent to which textbook activities contained within a collection of U.S. history textbooks, adopted by the State of Texas, foster the development of historical empathy and historical knowledge and skills. To examine the extent to which textbook activities cultivate historical empathy and historical knowledge, this study utilized a cognitive construct of historical empathy and drew from theoretical arguments, about the nature of historical knowledge, that are rooted in the practices utilized by historians to investigate past events. The current study, therefore, devotes careful attention to understanding how the textbook activities encourage students to utilize historical evidence and disciplinary procedures to inform their conclusions regarding the perspectives of historical actors.

The following chapter, chapter three, explains the research design and methodologies that were used to conduct the current study.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This study examined how 8th and 11th grade U.S. history textbooks adopted by the State of Texas cultivate historical empathy and disciplinary knowledge and skills in the subject of history through student engagement with textbook activities. Towards this end, the following research questions were posed:

- To what extent do textbook activities in 8th and 11th grade U.S. History textbooks, adopted by the State of Texas, foster historical empathy?

- What disciplinary knowledge and skills are students required to learn or demonstrate to complete textbooks activities designed to foster historical empathy?

These questions warrant a close examination of a complex phenomenon; therefore, this study utilized research methods consistent with a qualitative content analysis.

This chapter begins by describing the justifications behind utilizing a qualitative design to address the proposed research questions. The chapter then describes the data sources before discussing, in detail, the data collection and data analysis procedures. The chapter then concludes with a discussion of the study's limitations.

Methodology

Qualitative Content Analysis

This study utilized a qualitative content analysis to examine how Texas adopted 8th and 11th grade U.S. History textbooks foster historical empathy and historical knowledge structures through textbook activities. Content analyses are commonly used

in educational research and have long been a favorite method implemented by educational researchers to investigate textbook content (Colbert-Lewis, 2005; Frankel, Wallen & Hyun, 2015; Korin, 2008, Lucy et al., 2020; Stanford, 2016; Vanderhook, 2020).

Using content, a researcher interprets "the content of text data through the systematic classification process of coding and identifying themes or patterns" (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005, p. 1278). During the interpretation process, a focus is placed on analyzing the language and its associated meanings, as they are communicated through the content of text data (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005, Elo & Kyngäs, 2007; Elo, 2014; Schreier, 2012). Therefore, the goal of conducting a qualitative content analysis often centers on revealing knowledge or meaning, around the phenomenon under investigation (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005; Elo & Kyngäs, 2007). Because qualitative content analysis seeks to identify how language and meaning are communicated through text-based content, this method was the best fit for the study, as it examines the language and meaning communicated by textbook activities regarding the development of historical empathy and historical knowledge.

Directed Qualitative Content Analysis

With qualitative content analysis research, there are three different approaches to interpreting text data. Hsieh and Shannon (2020) classify these approaches as conventional, directed, and summative. This study utilized a directed content analysis approach to interpret activities in a sample of 8th and 11th grade U.S. History textbooks adopted in Texas. A directed content analysis approach uses existing theory or prior

research as a basis for analysis to reveal knowledge around the phenomenon under investigation and to expand upon a specific field of inquiry (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005). This study intends to further expand upon the research associated with historical empathy by examining how textbooks foster historical empathy and disciplinary knowledge and skills through activities.

The prior research that serves as the basis for the analysis stems from investigations that support a cognitive construct of historical empathy (Ashby & Lee, 1987; Ashby & Lee, 2001; Davis, 2001; Foster, 2001; Yeager & Foster, 2001). Advocates of the cognitive approach to historical empathy argue that students come to understand how historical figures "thought, felt, made decisions, acted, and faced consequences within a specific historical context" (Endacott & Brooks, 2013 p. 41) by using knowledge and skills associated with examining and using historical evidence (Ashby & Lee, 1987; Ashby & Lee, 2001; Davis, 2001; Foster, 2001; Yeager & Foster, 2001). The cognitive construct of historical empathy served as the basis of analysis for this study as it places more of a priority on utilizing historical evidence and disciplinary procedures to "more accurately" inform conclusions regarding the perspectives of historical actors.

Ashby and Lee's (1987) Five Levels of Historical Empathy Framework was utilized to create a categorization matrix upon which the activities were coded. The levels of Ashby & Lee's (1987) framework served as the coding categories for this study due to their adherence to a cognitive construct of historical empathy and their ability to deconstruct historical empathy into detectable levels.

To address the second research question posed for this study, the researcher created a categorization matrix to include categories that describe different types of historical knowledge and skills. The framework that served as the basis for this matrix is VanSledright's (2014) Historical Thinking and Understanding Framework. This framework was selected due to its grounding in the practices historians employ to make sense of the past. A more detailed description of the analytical frameworks and their subsequent categories can be found later in the chapter under the data analysis heading.

Data Sources

Textbook Selection

Purposeful sampling was utilized to select the textbooks examined for this study. Purposeful sampling is the selection of information-rich cases that align with a specific criteria (Elo & Kyngäs, 2007; Elo et al., 2014; Gall et al., 2005; Patton, 2002). In this study, textbooks selected for the sample had to satisfy the following inclusion criteria,

1. The textbooks must be among those adopted for use in the state of Texas
2. The textbooks must be designed to specifically teach the subject of U.S. History
3. The textbooks must be designed specifically for student use
4. The textbooks must have been adopted for use in the time frame in which the term historical empathy exists
5. The textbooks must be in a physical or hard copy format
6. The textbooks must be published by companies that have consistently published adopted textbooks

The first inclusion criterion associated with the textbook sample is that each book must be among those adopted for use in the State of Texas. Texas adopted U.S. History textbooks were selected for this study, as the state of Texas represents a major textbook market for publishers (Lucy et al., 2020). The state of Texas, for example, has the second-largest student population in the United States, with over 5.3 million K-12

students enrolled in the public school system (Texas Education Agency, 2021; National Center for Education Statistics, 2019a). Of the total, over 2.8 million students are enrolled in just secondary-based schools (Texas Education Agency, 2021).

The second inclusion criterion associated with the textbook sample is that each book must be designed, specifically, to teach the subject of U.S. History in Texas. The State Board of Education adopted the Texas Essential Knowledge as Skills (TEKS) as a guideline for what is to be taught in each subject in each grade. History is one of the eight subject strands found in each grade of the Social Studies TEKS. The subject of U.S. History, however, receives particular emphasis in grades 5, 8, and 11. The 5th grade U.S. History course, however, is considered to be a survey of U.S. History, while the 8th and 11th grade courses provide a more detailed and substantive content coverage (Texas Education Agency, 2018).

As a result, this study specifically examined textbooks associated with 8th and 11th grade U.S. History courses. In 8th-grade, students study the history of the United States from European exploration through Civil War Reconstruction, while students in 11th-grade study U.S. History since 1877 (Texas Education Agency, 2019). Students enrolled in Texas public schools are only assessed over their knowledge of U.S. History in both 8th and 11th grades through the State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (S.T.A.A.R) program.

The third inclusion criterion associated with the textbook sample is that each textbook must be designed, specifically, for student use. Student edition textbooks were selected due to the possibility that students may not interact with the activities present in

teacher edition textbooks. Teachers would need to engage students in teacher edition activities directly, while student edition activities could be more readily available. As a result, I assumed that students have more opportunities to interact with the activities in their student edition textbooks, as they are intentionally made for student viewing and use.

The fourth inclusion criterion associated with the textbook sample is that each textbook must have been published by, or used within, the time frame in which the term historical empathy exists. As a result, the sample of textbooks selected for this study consists of books from the 1970-1972 adoption cycle to the most current adoption cycle, 2015-2023. The 1970-1972 adoption cycle was selected as the starting point of the sample, as the term "historical empathy" was coined in 1972 with the creation of the "School History Project" in the United Kingdom (Endacott & Brooks, 2018). Since the 1970-1972 adoption cycle, there have been a total of seven adoption cycles in Texas for U.S. History textbooks. Across the seven adoption cycles, there have been a total of 67 textbooks recommended for use in 8th or 11th grade U.S. History courses.

The fifth inclusion criterion associated with the textbook sample is that each textbook must be available in a hard copy format. Hardcopy versions of textbooks were prioritized for this study for two reasons; one, not all adopted textbooks are available as online or electronic textbooks, and two, even where electronic versions were available, not all students had access to electronic textbooks. As a result, textbooks in a digital or online format were not analyzed.

The final inclusion criterion associated with the textbook sample is that each textbook must be published by companies that have "consistently" produced adopted textbooks. Consistency in publishing adopted texts was seen as an important criterion in the selection of the sample, as it often influences trust in the quality and selection of content. Publisher consistency was determined by comparing the total number of books published and the total number of appearances across adoption cycles. Through this comparison, three publishing companies demonstrated publishing consistency by producing at least seven adopted textbooks in total and appearing in at least 4 out of 7 of the adoption cycles.

Through a search of the Texas Education Agency records, I found that 67 textbooks were adopted in Texas for 8th or 11th grade U.S. History courses. After applying the selection criteria, 22 were identified for this study. One of the identified textbooks, *Rise of the American Nation: Volume Two* by Lewis Paul Todd and Merle Curti, did not meet the accessibility criterion and consequently was not included in the analysis. Therefore, the study's sample consists of 21 textbooks adopted in Texas for 8th or 11th-grade U.S. History courses. Eleven of the textbooks coordinate with 8th grade U.S. History content, while the remaining 10 books coordinate with 11th grade U.S. history content. In the sample, there is at least one 8th and 11th-grade textbook from each adoption cycle. A complete list of the selected textbooks for this study can be found in Appendix A.

Textbook Activities

The data for this study consists of historical empathy textbook activities, published in the textbook sample, that were designed to be completed by students. Textbook activities were targeted for this analysis because they are often designed to emphasize importance, guide student learning of social studies skills and content, and further expand upon the content contained within the text (Donnelly & Sharp, 2020). In this study, a textbook activity is defined as "any prompt", in the textbook, "that students are expected to do, beyond getting input solely from reading or listening, in order to learn, practice, apply, evaluate, or in any other way respond to curricular content" (Brophy & Alleman, 1991, p. 9). Furthermore, because this study seeks to examine how textbook activities foster historical empathy, only "historical empathy activities" were analyzed. Historical empathy activities are defined as those that ask students "to respond in the voice, or perspective of a historical actor" (Donnelly & Sharp, 2020, p. 97). An example of a historical empathy activity can be found below in Figure 1. Common identifiers of historical empathy activities are as follows,

- Imagine you are…
- If you were there…
- If you had lived during…
- What would you do if you were (them or there) ...

Figure 1

Example of a Historical Empathy Textbook Activity

If you were there… You live in Ohio in 1840. A few months ago, you and your family heard stories about a wonderful land in the Northwest, with sparkling rivers and fertile valleys. You all decide to pull up stakes and head West. You travel to Independence Missouri, planning to join a wagon train on the Oregon Trail. In Missouri, you're surprised to find hundreds of other people planning to make the trip. What would you expect your journey West to be like?

(Houghton, Mifflin & Harcourt, 2016, p. 346)

Data Collection

Because textbooks often serve as "multimodal texts", or texts where content is communicated by more than one mode, every aspect of the textbooks, excluding the table of contents, glossaries, and indexes, were examined for historical empathy activities. Historical empathy activities, therefore, were collected from various "types of prompts", including those in section and unit assessments, unit and section previews, section comprehension or reading checks, and those associated with maps, charts, images, and supplementary text-based sources.

As a result of the collection process, a total of 744 historical empathy activities were identified in the textbook sample. Once a historical empathy activity was identified, the prompt, along with a description of any other supporting information or materials, such as text content, images, charts, "documents" and maps, were cataloged into a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet. A Microsoft Excel spreadsheet was selected as the tool to catalog the activities as it offers the ability to easily organize, locate, and sort data according to a selected criterion.

Data Analysis

Analytical Frameworks

        The activities were analyzed through the use of researcher-created categorization matrices developed from prior investigations conducted in the field of historical empathy and disciplined historical inquiry. Specifically, the categorization matrices were developed from Ashby and Lee's (1987) Five Levels of Historical Empathy Framework and VanSledright's (2014) Historical Thinking and Understanding Framework. These frameworks were selected as the basis of analysis for this study due to their adherence to a cognitive construct of historical empathy, and their grounding in the practices utilized by historians to investigate past events.

Ashby & Lee's Five Levels of Historical Empathy

        The first framework I used to analyze the activities was Ashby & Lee's (1987) Five Levels of Historical Empathy Framework. Ashby and Lee's framework provides a measure of the "levels of historical empathy" that students are asked to display while completing textbook activities. Ashby and Lee's five levels represent a "logical hierarchy" where the ideas and questions gained within the higher stages of the framework subsume those within the lower levels. Ashby and Lee argue that movement into the different levels is not necessarily static or fixed, but instead depends upon student content familiarity and peer discussion. Therefore, students who have a deeper understanding of the content and who are subjected to learning environments rich in peer discussion are assumed to more readily display understandings consistent with the higher levels of Ashby and Lee's historical empathy framework. Ashby and Lee's five levels of historical empathy are as follows,

1.) The 'Divi' Past

2.) Generalized Stereotypes

3.) Everyday Empathy

4.) Restricted Historical Empathy

5.) Contextual Historical Empathy

During the coding process, numerical identifiers were used to classify the various levels of historical empathy encouraged by the activities. The numerical identifiers that were used to distinguish the various levels of historical empathy are displayed below in Table 1.

Table 1

Numerical Identifiers Assigned to The Five Levels of Historical Empathy Framework

Level of Historical Empathy	Numerical Identifier
The 'Divi' Past	1
Generalized Stereotypes	2
Everyday Empathy	3
Restricted Historical Empathy	4
Constructed Historical Empathy	5

(Ashby & Lee, 1987)

In the following sections, I will describe each level of Ashby & Lee's (1987) Five Levels of Historical Empathy Framework. I will also provide and discuss examples of activities that fall within specific levels of Ashby & Lee's (1987) historical empathy framework.

The 'Divi' Past.

The first level of historical empathy that Ashby and Lee argue students display is called the 'divi' past. The term "divi" (alternatively spelled "divvy") is a derogatory slang word that is used in the United Kingdom to refer to "a stupid person" (Cambridge Dictionary, n.d., divvy). Ashby and Lee are both from the United Kingdom so it is assumed that they are using this term to relate to their "intended audience". At the 'divi' past level of historical empathy students typically view historical figures and institutions as "mentally defective", or unintelligible due to the historical figures' failure or inability to recognize and implement a "better course of action" (p.68). Ashby and Lee state that students often arrive at these conclusions because they associate people in the past as being more "primitive" than people in the present. Students often view historical figures in this light because they are unable to understand that historical figures could not know, in general, or specific, about the situation in which they were involved. Students, in this case, are unable to separate the actions and decisions of the historical figure, within the historical context, from the hindsight they acquired about the time or event.

Activities that encourage students to display the 'divi' past level of historical empathy were coded as 1s. However, during the coding process, the research team found that no example of the 'divi' past level of historical empathy was found in any of the activities collected for this study. As a result, an example of an activity that encourages students to display the 'divi' past level of historical empathy cannot be provided. Based on the parameters outlining the 'divi' past level of historical empathy, however,

activities would have been coded as 1s if they had asked students to discuss how historical actors or institutions were "primitive, unknowing, or "mentally defective".

Generalized Stereotypes.

The second level of historical empathy that Ashby and Lee argue students engage in is called generalized stereotypes. At this level, students view historical figures, institutions, etc., through a "stereotypical lens" based upon people's similar actions, decisions, values, goals, and backgrounds (p. 72). Students at this level typically make routine projections about people in the past, based on "stereotypical identifiers", that may be unsupported by historical evidence. The "stereotypical identifiers" that students use to "understand" the actions of the historical figures could be representative of their own values and backgrounds, their society's values and backgrounds, or the values and backgrounds of an archetypal historical figure. At this level, students generally make no attempt to distinguish one historical actor from another, or a historical actor from other people, past or present, with similar backgrounds. Instead, students typically believe that all people from specific backgrounds "hold similar values and act in similar ways" (Donnelly & Sharp, 2020, p. 95).

Activities that encourage students to display the generalized stereotypes level of historical empathy were coded as 2s. An example of a typical activity that encourages students to display the generalized stereotypes level of historical empathy can be found below in Figure 2.

Figure 2

Example of a Generalized Stereotypes Historical Empathy Textbook Activity

---

 Imagine that you are an American Indian at the time of the French and Indian War. Would you prefer to fight on the side of the French or the British? Support your choice with sound reasoning based on fact.

(Garraty & Bacon,1992, p. 134)

The question in Figure 2 represents the generalized stereotypes level of historical empathy because it asks students to construct an argument on whether or not they would prefer to fight on the side of the French or the British, during the French and Indian War, from the perspective of an unaffiliated, or indistinguishable "American Indian." The activity prompt could indicate that Native American tribes allied themselves with either the French or British, but it makes no attempt to encourage students to distinguish between the different Native American tribes involved in the war, distinct tribal members in each community, and specific reasons different tribal members had for supporting one side over the other.

Furthermore, analyzing the text that corresponds with this question, I concluded that students have limited amounts of information upon which to base their responses. The corresponding text, for example, collectively refers to each Native American tribe that fought and participated in the French and Indian War as "Indians" and offers minimal perspectives regarding tribal motivations for involvement in the war. As a result, this activity encourages students to make generalized or stereotypical projections based on their own values and backgrounds, the current society's values and backgrounds, or some sort of archetypal historical figure's values and backgrounds to

answer whether or not a "indistinguishable" "American Indian" would fight on either the side of the French or the British.

Everyday Empathy.

The third level of historical empathy that Ashby and Lee argue students display is called everyday historical empathy. At this level, students take into account the perspectives of specific historical figures and institutions but interpret them by drawing heavily on their own life experiences. Ashby and Lee argue that everyday empathy and generalized stereotype empathy can appear similar when students use their personal experiences and values to make sense of the past but are different as everyday empathy relates more to the understanding of "particular circumstances and people involved" (p. 74).

Activities that encourage students to display the everyday level of historical empathy were coded as 3s. An example of a typical activity that encourages the everyday level of historical empathy can be found below in Figure 3.

Figure 3

Example of an Every Day Historical Empathy Textbook Activity

Pretend that you are the Soviet leader, Joseph Stalin. Write a formal note to Roosevelt and Churchill protesting the decision, made at Casablanca, to concentrate Allied strategy on the Mediterranean rather than on a cross-channel invasion. Your note should contain arguments against the decision.

(Risjord & Haywoode, 1979, p. 307)

The question in Figure 3 represents the everyday level of historical empathy, because it asks students to empathize with, or understand, Joseph Stalin's perspective

specifically, regarding the decision made by Franklin D. Roosevelt and Winston Churchill at the Casablanca Conference in 1943. Furthermore, this question also encourages students to pull from their "everyday" or personal experiences to respond to the prompt, as limited contextual information regarding Stalin's perspective on the Allied strategy in the Mediterranean is provided by the textbook. Stalin's perspective on the Allied strategy, for example, is confined to two sentences that state, "Stalin, when he learned of the decision, protested loudly. The western Allies replied that an invasion of Italy would help tie down German armies, but the Soviet leader still felt that he had been betrayed" (Risjord & Haywoode, 1979, p. 294). Because the textbook only provides students with this limited description of Stalin's perspective, the activity, therefore, encourages students to predominately pull from their "everyday" or personal experiences to respond to the prompt.

Restricted Historical Empathy.

The fourth level of historical empathy that Ashby and Lee argue students display is called restricted historical empathy. At this level, students are able to accept that historical figures perceived their world differently than we do today, that historical evidence is needed to support their understandings of the historical figure's perspective, and that there are multiple perspectives associated with historical events, but they are unable to relate these perspectives to larger historical and social contexts that lay beyond the immediate historical situation. Students at this level, therefore, are likely to experience "instability" as their ability to rationalize how the perspectives of historical figures fit within larger historical and social contexts is restricted. As a result of this

46

instability, Ashby and Lee argue that students can potentially move backward in the historical empathy levels, especially if they resort to believing that historical figures and institutions are unintelligible or ignorant (p. 79).

Activities that encourage students to display the restricted level of historical empathy were coded as 4s. An example of a typical activity that encourages the restricted level of historical empathy can be found below in Figure 4.

Figure 4

Example of a Restricted Historical Empathy Textbook Activity

You are a member of Congress in August 1964. President Johnson has just announced that the U.S. destroyer Maddox has been attacked in the Gulf of Tonkin by North Vietnamese forces. He has asked Congress to authorize the use of military force to "prevent further aggression". Follow these steps to make a decision on whether to support his request. Use your textbook to gather information that might influence your decision whether to move. Be sure to use what you learned about the Vietnam War and the constitutional authority of the executive and legislative branches to help you make an effective decision. You may want to divide up different parts of the research among group members. Once you have gathered information, identify options. Based on the information that you have gathered; consider the options you might recommend for supporting or denying the President's request. Be sure to record your possible options for your presentation. Once you have identified these options. predict the consequences for each option. For example, what might happen if you pass a Tonkin Gulf Resolution? How will a resolution affect the relationship between the executive and legislative branches? Once you have predicted the consequences, record them as notes for your presentation. Take action to implement your decision. Once you have considered your options, you should create a presentation about your decision. You will need to support your decision by including information you gathered and by explaining why you rejected other options. You may want to create maps or a sequencing diagram to help you explain your decision. Have one person present the decision to the class.

(Boyer & Stucky, 2003, p. 734)

The question in Figure 4 represents the restricted level of historical empathy, because it encourages students to recognize that multiple perspectives surrounding the

47

decision to pass the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution exist, and that historical evidence is needed both to understand the situation and to support their decisions on whether to vote in favor of the resolution. Based on the question prompt, however, it is unknown whether or not the student will still rely on their personal experiences or values to answer the prompt. Nevertheless, because the directions encourage students to gather additional outside information, it is less likely that students will use their personal values or experiences to answer the prompt, as they will have access to more content knowledge in the supplemental resources.

Furthermore, this question also somewhat restricts students from achieving higher levels of historical empathy, such as constructed historical empathy, because it encourages students to grapple with the decision on whether or not to move in favor of the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution, within the specific contexts of the Vietnam War and the constitutional authority of the executive and legislative branches.

Contextual Historical Empathy.

The fifth level of historical empathy that Ashby and Lee argue students display is called contextual historical empathy. At this level, students are not only able to accept that historical figures perceived their world differently, that historical evidence is needed to support their understandings of a historical perspective, and that there are multiple perspectives associated with historical events, but also are able to fit what was learned about these perspectives into wider historical and social contexts (Ashby & Lee, 1987).

Activities that encourage students to display the constructed level of historical empathy were coded as 5s. However, during the coding process, the research team found

that the constructed level of historical empathy was not encouraged in any of the activities. As a result, an example of a constructed historical empathy textbook activity cannot be provided. However, in referencing the activity affiliated with the restricted level of historical empathy provided above in Figure 4, this question could have represented the constructed level of historical empathy if it had encouraged students to contextualize the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution within the larger Cold War period. By encouraging students to further contextualize the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution within the larger period of the Cold War, the students would apply what they learned about the historical perspectives in the original contexts to a wider context.

VanSledright's Historical Thinking and Understanding Framework

The second framework that I used to analyze the historical empathy textbook activities is VanSledright's (2014) Historical Thinking and Understanding Framework. Vansledright's framework outlines the kinds of disciplinary knowledge and skills that students are required to learn and/or demonstrate to complete the activities designed to foster historical empathy. VanSledright's framework of historical thinking and understanding is largely based on the practices that historians employ to make sense of the past. Historians have to form questions about the past, gather and organize source material, evaluate perspectives, and use evidence to both assemble and defend an account of the historical event or situation (Brooks, 2010; VanSledright, 2014). Through participating in these processes, VanSledright argues that historians rely on two domains of knowledge - substantive and strategic knowledge. Substantive knowledge, however,

can be further broken down into three subdomains. VanSledright's (2014) framework of

historical knowledge and skills, therefore, is as follows,

1.) Low Complexity First Ordered Substantive Historical Knowledge

2.) Higher Complexity First Ordered Substantive Historical Knowledge

3.) Second Ordered Substantive Historical Knowledge

4.) Strategic Historical Knowledge

To assist in the coding process, alpha code identifiers were used to classify the

various domains and subdomains of historical knowledge encouraged by the activities.

The alpha code identifiers that were used to distinguish the various domains of historical

knowledge are displayed below in Table 2.

Table 2

Alpha Identifiers Assigned to VanSledright's Historical Thinking Framework

Domains of Historical Knowledge	Alpha Identifier
Low Complexity, First Ordered Substantive Historical Knowledge	A
Higher Complexity, First Ordered Substantive Historical Knowledge	B
Second Ordered Substantive Historical Knowledge	C
Strategic Historical Knowledge	D

(VanSledright, 2014)

In the following sections, I will describe each domain and subdomain of

historical knowledge outlined in VanSledright's (2014) Historical Thinking and

Understanding Framework. Examples of historical empathy textbook activities that require each domain of historical knowledge will also be provided.

Substantive Historical Knowledge.

Substantive historical knowledge according to VanSledright is the "content knowledge", or the "narratives, arguments, and explanations about the past" (p. 40). VanSledright argues that historians "acquire" substantive knowledge as they undergo the process of historical research, which utilizes strategic knowledge skills. Substantive knowledge, according to Vansledright's model, is divided into first-ordered and second-ordered knowledge.

Low Complexity, First Ordered Substantive Knowledge.

First-ordered substantive knowledge can be broken down into various subdomains that are subject-specific and range in complexity. Take into consideration some content knowledge about the Boston Massacre. Content knowledge relating to this topic could be the simple identification of when the Boston Massacre occurred and the more complex understanding of the impact the Boston Massacre had on colonial motivation to advocate for independence. These two pieces of information both relate to the Boston Massacre, but range in complexity.

In this study, activities that required students to simply recall or explain historical events, were considered to be representative of VanSledright's low complexity, first ordered substantive historical knowledge. Activities that tasked students to recall or explain information were considered to be "less complex" because students only had to repeat or "reformat" information about a historical event or figure. Activities that

51

encouraged students to utilize low complexity, first ordered substantive historical

knowledge were coded as "A". A typical example of a activity that encourages students

to utilize low complexity first ordered substantive historical knowledge, in their response

to the prompt, can be found below in Figure 5.

Figure 5

Example of a Low Complexity, First Ordered Substantive Historical Knowledge
Activity

You have been assigned to cover the Lincoln-Douglas debates for a Chicago
newspaper. In your article, explain the issues presented in the debates.

(Garraty & Bacon, 1992, p. 528)

The question in Figure 5 represents first ordered substantive historical knowledge

because it asks students to simply recall and describe the issues presented in the Lincoln-

Douglas debates. Students are not being asked to provide an opinion of the issues or to

apply these issues to other situations, ideas or concepts. Instead, students simply must

explain or reformat the issues discussed in the Lincoln-Douglas debates in a newspaper

article.

Higher Complexity, First Ordered Substantive Knowledge.

Activities that required students to construct and defend arguments concerning a

historical perspective or apply content knowledge to other situations or concepts were

considered representative of VanSledright's higher complexity, first ordered substantive

historical knowledge. These types of activities were considered to be "more complex"

because students had to move beyond the simple recalling or reformatting of information

to answer the prompt. Activities that encourage students to utilize higher complexity,

first ordered were coded as "B". A typical example of an activity that encourages

students to utilize higher complexity knowledge, in their response to the prompt, can be

found below in Figure 6.

Figure 6

Example of a Higher Complexity, First Ordered Substantive Historical Knowledge Activity

It is the night of December 16, 1773. You, Samuel Adams, and several others disguise yourselves as Mohawks, board East India Company ships anchored in Boston Harbor, and dump English tea chests overboard. Are you committing a crime, or are you committing an act of political protest? Support your position with sound reasoning.

(Garraty & Bacon, 1992, p. 178)

The question in Figure 6 represents higher complexity, substantive knowledge because it

encourages students to utilize the content knowledge of the Boston Tea Party and

Samuel Adams' specific role, to construct and defend an argument as to whether or not

Adams believed his actions were consistent with vandalism or activism. By utilizing

content knowledge related to Samuel Adams' perspective, to defend an argument related

to social concepts such as vandalism or activism, students use a more complex type of

first ordered substantive historical knowledge.

Second Ordered Substantive Knowledge.

The third subdomain of substantive historical knowledge, second ordered

substantive knowledge, consists of the conceptual ideas surrounding a past historical

event, such as decline and progress, change and continuity, cause and effect, conflict and

resolution, historical context, and historical significance (2014). VanSledright argues

that utilizing conceptual ideas, such as those listed above, can "simplify," clarify and

deepen understandings of accounts or events of the past.

Historical empathy activities that encouraged students to utilize second ordered substantive knowledge were coded as "C". An example of an activity that encourages students to utilize second ordered knowledge can be found below in Figure 7.

Figure 7

Example of a Second Ordered Substantive Historical Knowledge Activity

---

Imagine that you are an economic adviser to President Roosevelt. Write a paper evaluating the economic effects of the Open Door Policy. Consider the following, the reasons why Hay pursued the policy, the other nations involved, the policy's principles.

(Boyer & Stucky, 2003, p. 332)

The textbook activity in Figure 7 represents a question that encourages students to utilize second ordered substantive knowledge because it prompts students to use the concept of cause and effect to further understand the economic impacts associated with the Open Door Policy.

Strategic Historical Knowledge.

The second domain of historical knowledge is called strategic knowledge. Strategic knowledge consists of the skills and practices historians utilize to "do history", or to process and understand substantive knowledge. The strategic knowledge skills that historians often utilize consist of analyzing sources, sourcing historical documents, corroborating sources, determining reliability and bias, locating and selecting evidence, and framing the historical, social, political, and economic contexts. Additionally, historians may rely on second-order historical concepts to organize and make sense of

54

evidence. Through utilizing these skills, historians attempt to piece together the most precise narrative of past events or situations.

Activities that encouraged students to utilize strategic historical knowledge were coded as "D." An example of an activity that encourages students to utilize strategic historical knowledge can be found below in Figure 8.

Figure 8

Example of a Strategic Historical Knowledge Textbook Activity

A selection from *The Wall* by John Hersey appears on pages 803-804. Read it and then answer following questions: How does this section help you feel what it must have been like inside the Warsaw ghetto?

(DiBacco, Mason, & Appy, 1992, p. 439)

The question in Figure 8 represents an activity that encourages students to utilize strategic knowledge because it prompts students use the skills employed by historians, such as reading and analyzing a "historical source" (i.e. John Hersey's *The Wall*), to understand what it might have felt like to be inside of the Warsaw ghetto.

Analytical Procedures

Coding Scheme

The activities collected for this study were coded according to Ashby & Lee's Five Levels of Historical Empathy Framework (1987) and VanSledright's Historical Thinking and Understanding Framework (2014). During the coding process, each activity was given both a numerical and alpha code identifier based upon the two analytical frameworks. The numerical identifiers correspond with Ashby and Lee's Five Levels of Historical Empathy, with each number representing a different level of

historical empathy. On the other hand, the alpha code identifiers correspond with

VanSledright's Historical Thinking and Understanding Framework (2014). Each letter

from A to D represents either a different domain or subdomain of historical knowledge.

An example of the categorization matrices, and their subsequent coding categories, can

be found below in Table 3.

Table 3

Example Categorization Matrices & Corresponding Pre-Existing Coding Categories

Ashby & Lee's Five Levels of Historical Empathy Framework (1987)		VanSledright's Historical Thinking and Understanding Framework (2014)	
The 'Divi' Past	1	Low Complexity, First Ordered Substantive Historical Knowledge	A
Generalized Stereotypes	2	Higher Complexity, First Ordered Substantive Historical Knowledge	B
Everyday Empathy	3	Second Ordered Substantive Historical Knowledge	C
Restricted Historical Empathy	4	Strategic Historical Knowledge	D
Contextual Historical Empathy	5		

(Ashby & Lee, 1987; VanSledright, 2014)

Pre-Established Coding Rule.

Before coding each of the activities, I determined that an activity cannot be

coded as representing both everyday empathy (Code # 3) and low complexity, first

ordered historical knowledge (Code A). This coding rule was established as everyday empathy requires students to move beyond factual recall to understand the "particular circumstances and people involved" in historical events or time periods (Ashby & Lee, 1987, p.74). Understanding the perspective of a particular actor and circumstance, therefore, requires a more complex type of historical knowledge as students are tasked with thinking through specific content and contexts and not the information that may broadly apply to historical groups or "archetypal figures".

Coding Procedures

A trained second coder participated in coding the activities collected for this study. The second coder holds a Doctor of Philosophy degree in Curriculum and Instruction and has conducted similar content analysis research. The coder has also had similar research published in accredited peer-reviewed journals and accepted at national education research conferences.

On January 20th, 2022, the researcher met with the consultant coder to conduct an initial coder training session. The training session began with a discussion of each coding category within both Ashby & Lee's (1987) Five Levels of Historical Empathy Framework and VanSledright's (2014) Historical Thinking and Understanding Framework. This discussion familiarized the coders with the general coding scheme and offered clarification regarding how the various coding categories intersect. Once the consultant coder became more familiar with the coding scheme, the research team collaboratively scored a sample of the historical empathy-based textbook activities to

develop an understanding of how keywords and phrases found in the activities

correspond to the various categories in the coding matrix.

Through this discussion, the research team determined that some of the activities

required students to display more than one type of historical empathy or domain of

historical knowledge in their response. The research team agreed that the questions

requiring students to use more than one type of historical empathy or domain of

historical knowledge should be double or even triple coded if necessary. An example of

a question that received a double code for both the type of historical empathy and

historical knowledge can be found below in Figure 9.

Figure 9

Example of a "Double Coded" Activity

Read the excerpt from Henry Ford's Book "My Life and Work" then answer the
following questions, 14. Henry Ford Explains the Advantages of The Assembly Line -
Business and industry continued to expand rapidly during the early years of the
twentieth century. One of the most spectacular developments was the assembly-line
technique he developed for the production of Ford automobiles. Do you think that you,
as a worker, would have shared Henry Ford's enthusiasm for the new technique? What
were its advantages? Its disadvantages?

(Todd, L. P., & Curti, M., 1972, p. 329)

The activity displayed in Figure 9 was double coded as a 2/3/B/D because

students are required to utilize two types of historical empathy and two domains of

historical knowledge in their response to the activity prompt. The types of historical

empathy that this question asks for students to display is generalized stereotypes and

everyday historical empathy. The generalized stereotypes level of historical empathy is

encouraged when the students are tasked with taking on the perspective of a nameless,

indistinguishable, worker in one of Henry Ford's factories that contained an assembly line. The everyday level of historical empathy is encouraged in this activity when the students are tasked with understanding Henry Ford's enthusiasm for the new assembly line technique. Students have to empathize with both the indistinguishable worker and Henry Ford in order to answer the activity prompt.

This activity also encourages students to utilize more than one domain of historical knowledge in their response to the prompt. The types of historical knowledge that students are encouraged to use are higher complexity first ordered substantive knowledge and strategic knowledge. Students use higher complexity first ordered substantive knowledge when they are tasked to construct and defend an argument concerning whether or not they, as the factory worker, would have shared Ford's enthusiasm for the assembly line. Students use strategic historical knowledge when they have to locate and analyze Henry Ford's perspective about the new assembly line technique from the excerpted passage of Henry Ford's book, "My Life and Work".

Once the coding scheme was "recalibrated" to accommodate the activities that required the use of more than one type of historical empathy or domain of historical knowledge, the research team then individually coded another sample of activities. The research team determined that one hundred percent inter-coder agreement was necessary for adequate reliability. The research team achieved this level of agreement through discussion.

In order to ensure reliability for the current study, the coding scheme was required to achieve similar results on repeated trials among the two coders. The research

team met at least once a month, for four months, to maintain intercoder reliability. During these meetings, activities were selected at random to be discussed by the research team. The research team determined that a one hundred percent consensus was required for adequate reliability. If a 100 percent consensus was not initially achieved, the team members discussed each scoring discrepancy until they reached an agreement.

Additional Analytical Procedures

Once the activities were coded, they were grouped and sorted with the aid of the data sorting function within Microsoft Excel. The activities were grouped and analyzed by both their level of historical empathy and their associated domains of historical knowledge.

Limitations & Delimitations

Limitations

Similar to other research studies, the current study is also subject to limitations. The limitations of this study relate to the inaccessibility of the 1968 edition of Lewis Paul Todd and Merle Curti's *Rise of the American Nation: Volume Two* textbook. Todd and Curit's (1968) *Rise of the American Nation: Volume Two* textbook is the only textbook that met the selection criteria but was not analyzed. As a result, the analysis and the subsequent findings of this study are limited to the historical empathy activities collected from the available textbooks in the sample.

Chapter Summary

This study employed a qualitative content analysis design to examine how activities in Texas adopted 8th, and 11th-grade U.S. History textbooks cultivate

historical empathy and disciplinary knowledge and skills in the subject of history. To achieve this purpose, the following research questions were posed: 1.) To what extent do textbook activities in 8th and 11th grade U.S. History textbooks, adopted by the State of Texas, foster historical empathy? 2.) What disciplinary knowledge and skills are students required to learn and/or demonstrate to complete textbooks activities designed to foster historical empathy?

A total of 744 historical empathy activities were collected from a purposefully selected sample of Texas adopted 8th and 11th-grade U.S. History textbooks. The activities were then analyzed by using two analytical frameworks established within existing scholarship related to historical empathy and disciplined historical inquiry. These frameworks were selected due to their adherence to a cognitive construct of historical empathy and their grounding in the knowledge and skills utilized by historians to investigate the past. Specifically, this study utilized the Five Levels of Historical Empathy Framework developed by Ashby and Lee (1987) and the Historical Thinking and Understanding Framework developed by VanSledright (2104) as a basis for analysis.

To ensure the reliability of the coding scheme and the overall analytical process, an expert coder was consulted. The researcher and the expert coder meet frequently over the span of a fourth-month period to code the activities and to maintain adequate intercoder reliability. The research team determined that one hundred percent inter-coder agreement was necessary for adequate reliability.

The following chapter will present the findings of this study as they relate to the

two research questions discussed in the previous three chapters.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

This study utilized a qualitative content analysis design to examine how 8th and 11th grade U.S. history textbooks, adopted by the State of Texas, foster historical empathy and disciplinary knowledge and skills in the subject of history through student engagement with textbook activities. Towards this end, the following research questions were posed:

- To what extent do textbook activities in 8th and 11th grade U.S. History textbooks, adopted by the State of Texas, foster historical empathy?

- What disciplinary knowledge and skills are students required to learn and/or demonstrate to complete textbook activities designed to foster historical empathy?

This chapter presents the findings of the analysis by discussing the emerging types of historical empathy and historical knowledge that are present in the activities collected for this study. This chapter begins by describing the general findings of the study such as the emerging categories of historical empathy and historical knowledge, and their frequencies. The chapter then describes the findings associated with each emerging category of historical empathy, and the types of historical knowledge and skills they encourage students to utilize. The chapter concludes with a summary of the study's findings as they relate to the two research questions guiding this inquiry.

The data collected and analyzed for this study consists of 744 historical empathy textbook activities. A historical empathy textbook activity is "any prompt" in the

textbook "that students are expected to do, beyond getting input solely from reading or listening", that specifically asks the student to "respond in the voice, or perspective of a historical actor" (Brophy & Alleman, 1991, p. 9; Donnelly & Sharp, 2020, p. 97). Each of the activities were collected from a purposefully selected sample of 8th and 11th-grade U.S. History textbooks, adopted in the State of Texas. Within the sample of textbooks, the activities were collected from different types of prompts, including those in section and unit assessments, unit and section previews, section comprehension or reading checks, and those associated with maps, charts, images, and supplementary text-based sources.

The activities were then analyzed according to both Ashby and Lee's (1987) Five Levels of Historical Empathy Framework and VanSledright's (2104) Historical Thinking and Understanding Framework to determine how 8th and 11th grade U.S. history textbooks cultivate historical empathy and historical knowledge. Each activity was given both a numerical and alpha code identifier based upon the two analytical frameworks. The numerical identifiers correspond with Ashby and Lee's Five Levels of Historical Empathy, with each number representing a different level of historical empathy. The alpha code identifiers correspond with VanSledright's Historical Thinking and Understanding Framework, with each letter from A to D representing a different type of historical knowledge. In some cases, the activities were double or even tripled coded depending on whether or not they required students to display more than one type of historical empathy or domain of historical knowledge. An example of the various coding

categories associated with each framework can be found in the previous chapter on Page 56 in Table 3. For the readers' convenience, a duplicate of Table 3 can be found below.

Table 3

Example Categorization Matrices & Corresponding Pre-Existing Coding Categories

Ashby & Lee's Five Levels of Historical Empathy Framework (1987)		VanSledright's Historical Thinking and Understanding Framework (2014)	
The 'Divi' Past	1	Low Complexity, First Ordered Substantive Historical Knowledge	A
Generalized Stereotypes	2	Higher Complexity, First Ordered Substantive Historical Knowledge	B
Everyday Empathy	3	Second Ordered Substantive Historical Knowledge	C
Restricted Historical Empathy	4	Strategic Historical Knowledge	D
Contextual Historical Empathy	5		

(Ashby & Lee, 1987; VanSledright, 2014)

To ensure reliability, an expert coder was consulted to both code and analyze the activities. The research team, consisting of the author and expert coder, met at least once a month, for four months, to maintain intercoder reliability. The research team determined that a one hundred percent consensus was required for adequate reliability. If a one hundred percent consensus was not initially achieved, the team members discussed each coding discrepancy until an agreement was reached.

Table 4 presents a summary of the frequencies associated with each of the identified levels of historical empathy and their corresponding domains of historical knowledge. The letters presented in the table correlate with the following domains and subdomains of historical knowledge,

- A – Low Complexity First Ordered Substantive Knowledge
- B – Higher Complexity First Ordered Substantive Knowledge
- A/B - Low Complexity First Ordered Substantive Knowledge & Higher Complexity First Ordered Substantive Knowledge
- C – Second Ordered Substantive Knowledge
- A/C - Low Complexity First Ordered Substantive Knowledge & Second Ordered Substantive Knowledge
- B/C - Higher Complexity First Ordered Substantive Knowledge & Second Ordered Substantive Knowledge
- D – Strategic Knowledge
- A/C/D - Low Complexity First Ordered Substantive Knowledge, Second Ordered Substantive Knowledge, & Strategic Knowledge
- B/C/D - Higher Complexity First Ordered Substantive Knowledge Second Ordered Substantive Knowledge & Strategic Knowledge

Table 4

Frequency Counts for Types of Historical Empathy & Historical Knowledge

	Levels of Historical Empathy						
Domains of Historical Knowledge	The 'Divi' Past 1	Generalized Stereotypes 2	Everyday Empathy 3	Generalized Stereotypes & Everyday Empathy 2/3	Restricted Historical Empathy 4	Contextual Historical Empathy 5	Sum of Domains of Historical Knowledge
A	0	335	*	0	0	0	335
A/B	0	9	0	0	0	0	9
A/C	0	14	0	0	0	0	14
A/D	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
A/C/D	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
B	0	263	40	15	0	0	318
B/C	0	13	2	0	0	0	15
B/D	0	34	3	1	0	0	38
B/C/D	0	0	0	0	13	0	13
Sum of Levels of Historical Empathy	0	670	45	16	13	0	744

*Due a decision made about this intersection no examples could be found.

Emerging Levels of Historical Empathy

The analysis of the activities indicates that three types of historical empathy were

encouraged from the sample of U.S. history textbooks. The three levels of historical

empathy that the textbook sample encourages students to display are generalized stereotypes, every day, and restricted historical empathy. Of these types of historical empathy, 670 of the activities prompt students to display the second level of historical empathy, generalized stereotypes. The generalized stereotype level of historical empathy typically encourages students to make routine projections about people in the past, based on "stereotypical identifiers" (Ashby & Lee, 1987). Further, the analysis also reveals that higher levels of historical empathy such as, everyday empathy and restricted historical empathy, are seldom encouraged among the activities. Of the 744 activities, for example, only 61 of the activities encourage students to display everyday empathy, and only 13 of the activities encourage students to display restricted historical empathy. The highest level of historical empathy, Constructed Historical Empathy, was not encouraged in a single activity collected for this study. Similarly, questions requiring the lowest level of historical empathy, the 'Divi' Past, were not found among any of the activities.

In addition to finding that the activities encouraged students to display the generalized stereotypes, every day, and restricted levels of historical empathy, this study also found that some of the activities required students to display more than one type of historical empathy to respond to the prompt. Of the 744 activities, 16 encourage students to display both the generalized stereotypes and everyday levels of historical empathy. The combination of these two types of historical empathy was the only way in which the various levels of historical empathy were combined in the activities collected for this study. An example of the combination of both the generalized stereotypes and everyday

levels of historical empathy can be found in the previous chapter in Figure 9 on page 58 in this dissertation.

Emerging Domains of Historical Knowledge

In terms of the disciplinary knowledge and skills that the activities encourage students to utilize, all four of VanSledright's (2014) domains or subdomains of historical knowledge were found across the textbook sample. Among the domains of historical knowledge, low-complexity first ordered substantive historical knowledge (A code) and higher-complexity first ordered substantive historical knowledge (B code) were encouraged the most. Second ordered substantive historical knowledge (C code) and strategic historical knowledge (Code D) on the other hand, were seldom encouraged, as these knowledge domains only appeared in a total of 43 and 53 textbook activities.

Of the 43 activities that were coded as representing second ordered substantive historical knowledge (C code), 40 of the questions required students to either identify or organize historical information as it related to the concept of cause and effect. An example of an activity that encourages students to utilize the concept of cause and effect can be found in the previous chapter in Figure 7. Other historical concepts associated with second ordered substantive knowledge such as decline and progress, change and continuity, conflict and resolution, and historical significance (VanSledright, 2014), were rarely required. Of the 744 activities, only two questions prompted students to utilize the concept of conflict and resolution and only one question required students to apply the concept of change and continuity.

The activities that required students to use strategic historical knowledge (D code) varied in the types of skills they prompted students to perform. Out of the 53 activities, for example, students were either required to collect and assemble research materials or "analyze" sources. In some cases, students would perform both skills, depending on the activity prompt. Of the activities coded as requiring strategic historical knowledge, 15 activities prompted students to both collect and analyze sources of information pertaining to a historical event. Additionally, out of these activities, 13 corresponded with prompts that required students to display the restricted level of historical empathy. Although these questions required students to both collect and "analyze" research materials, neither the textbook nor the corresponding activities provided students with support to practice either skill. An example of an activity that required students to both collect and analyze sources of information can be found in the previous chapter in Figure 4.

The remaining 38 activities that were coded as representing strategic historical knowledge, required students to "analyze" sources. The sources that students were required to analyze also varied across the activities. The types of sources that students were commonly prompted to "analyze" include, visual sources, such as paintings, photographs, maps, and charts, and text-based sources such as, journal and diary entries, transcribed speeches, secondary historical accounts, literary works of historical fiction, poems, and legal documents. Additionally, among these sources, only 34 are considered to be primary sources. The remaining four sources are either secondary accounts or literary works published years after the historical actors, perspectives, or events existed.

Furthermore, among the activities that prompt students to utilize primary sources, none

of the questions contain primary sources that represent multiple perspectives. Instead,

every single one of the primary sources directly coordinates with a historical event to

which the targeted historical perspective is associated. An example of an activity that

required students to analyze a text-based source can be found in the previous chapter in

Figure 8. Summaries about the types of sources that students were required to analyze

can be found below in Table 5 and Table 6.

Table 5

Types of Visual Sources

Source Type	Frequency
Chart	8
Map	3
Painting	2
Photograph	2
Political Cartoon	1

Table 6

Types of Text-Based Sources

Source Type	Frequency
Books Written by a Historian	2
Books Written by a Historical Figure	2
Diary or Journal Entry	3
Historical Fiction Excerpt	2
Legal Documents	2
Pamphlet	1
Poem	1
Transcribed Speech	6
Transcribed Radio Broadcast	1
Trial Report or Recap	2

In addition to finding that each of VanSledright's (2014) domains of historical knowledge were represented across the textbook sample, this study also found that a number of the activities also required students to use more than one domain of historical knowledge to respond to the prompts. Out of the 744 activities, for example, 91 encourage students to utilize more than one type of historical knowledge. The most frequently occurring combinations of the domains of historical knowledge were, higher complexity first ordered substantive knowledge & strategic knowledge (B/D - 38 total activities), higher complexity first ordered substantive knowledge & second ordered substantive knowledge (B/C - 15 total activities), low complexity first ordered

substantive knowledge & second ordered substantive knowledge (A/C - 14 total activities), and higher complexity first ordered substantive knowledge, second ordered substantive knowledge & strategic knowledge (B/C/D - 13 total activities). An example of a textbook activity that requires students to use a combination of first ordered substantive knowledge & strategic knowledge can be found in the previous chapter in Figure 9 on page 58 in this dissertation.

These findings are significant as they convey additional information relating to how the textbook activities attempt to foster historical knowledge. These activities reveal that textbook activities often require students to use more than one domain or subdomain of historical knowledge to answer the prompt. Engaging in more than one domain of historical knowledge is significant because it more closely models the processes that historians utilize to understand the past. To understand the past, historians rely on both substantive and strategic historical knowledge, and it appears that students are provided with some opportunities to practice portions of the historical inquiry process.

However, some combinations of historical knowledge in the textbook activities do not model the historical inquiry process as they task students to interact with second ordered substantive historical knowledge and strategic historical knowledge skills in less meaningful ways. For example, in the current study, 15 of the activities were coded as requiring students to display both second ordered historical knowledge and low complexity first ordered substantive knowledge. In these activities, students were tasked with recalling or restating content knowledge as it related to historical concepts such as cause and effect. As a result, these activities encouraged students to use second ordered

substantive knowledge in less meaningful ways as they only required students to "identify", and not to "contextualize", conceptual information associated with a historical perspective. Furthermore, in terms of strategic historical knowledge, two of the activities simply required students to read and recall information in the sources, instead of applying the knowledge to the perspectives associated with historical figures.

Conclusion

This chapter reports the findings associated with the study's analysis of how 744 historical empathy textbook activities foster student development of historical empathy and historical knowledge. In this chapter I used a table to display the findings of the content analysis. Table 4 displays the frequency of each level of historical empathy (Ashby & Lee, 1987) and domain of historical knowledge (VanSledright, 2014) that appeared within the historical empathy activities collected for this study. The major conclusion is that students are often not required to display high levels of either historical empathy or historical knowledge when completing textbook activities. Additionally, this study found that while students are often not required to display high levels of historical knowledge, they are opportunities for students to utilize multiple types of historical knowledge when responding to activity prompts.

The next chapter, chapter five, will discuss the emerging categories of both historical empathy and historical knowledge that were found during the analysis of the historical empathy activities. Chapter five then will discuss the findings as they relate to the literature reviewed in chapter two. Afterwards, the chapter will discuss the implications of these findings as they relate to teacher textbook use. Chapter five will

then conclude with recommendations regarding future research as it relates to this specific study and topic area.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION & CONCLUSIONS

This chapter provides a discussion of the emerging categories of both historical empathy and historical knowledge that were found during the analysis of the historical empathy textbook activities. The chapter begins with a summary of the analysis process and then proceeds to discuss the study's results as they relate to the literature reviewed in chapter two. This chapter will then discuss the implications of these findings as they relate to teacher textbook use. The chapter will conclude with recommendations regarding future research as it relates to the cultivation of historical empathy and historical knowledge.

Review of The Methodology

This study utilized a qualitative content analysis design to examine how 8th and 11th grade U.S. history textbooks, adopted for use in the State of Texas, foster historical empathy and disciplinary knowledge and skills in the subject of history through student engagement with textbook activities. The research questions that guided this study are as follows,

- To what extent do textbook activities in 8th and 11th grade U.S. History textbooks, adopted by the State of Texas, foster historical empathy?

- What disciplinary knowledge and skills are students required to learn and or demonstrate to complete textbook activities designed to foster historical empathy?

The data collected and analyzed for this study consists of 744 historical empathy textbook activities. A historical empathy textbook activity is "any prompt" in the textbook "that students are expected to do, beyond getting input solely from reading or listening," that specifically asks the student to "respond in the voice, or perspective of a historical actor" (Brophy & Alleman, 1991, p. 9; Donnelly & Sharp, 2020, p. 97). The activities were collected from different types of prompts, including those in section and unit assessments, unit and section previews, section comprehension or reading checks, and those associated with maps, charts, images, and supplementary text-based sources.

The activities were analyzed according to both Ashby and Lee's (1987) Five Levels of Historical Empathy Framework and VanSledright's (2104) Historical Thinking and Understanding Framework to determine how 8th and 11th grade U.S. history textbooks cultivate historical empathy and historical knowledge. These frameworks were selected as the basis of analysis for this study due to their adherence to a cognitive construct of historical empathy and their grounding in the practices utilized by historians to investigate past events. To ensure reliability, an expert coder was consulted to both code and analyze the activities. The research team determined that a one hundred percent consensus was required for adequate reliability.

Conclusions

Conclusions Related to Historical Empathy Development

The results of the analysis, in terms of the first research question, reveal that students have few opportunities to learn and demonstrate higher levels of historical empathy if they engage with historical empathy textbook activities. Out of the 744

activities collected for this study, 686 required students to display the generalized stereotypes level of historical empathy in their response to the activity prompts. The generalized stereotypes level of historical empathy occurs when students make routine, and often unsupported, projections about people in the past, based on "stereotypical identifiers" that are developed from either the student's values or backgrounds, the current society's values or backgrounds, or the values and backgrounds associated with an archetypal historical figure (Ashby & Lee, 1987). Furthermore, the textbook content associated with each of the 686 questions also provided students with limited contextual information upon which to base their responses. As a result, it is likely that students will further rely on either their own values or backgrounds, the current society's values or backgrounds, or the values and backgrounds associated with an archetypal historical figure to make their stereotypical claims about the perspectives of historical actors (Ashby & Lee, 1987).

These findings align with previous research that also explored the ability of textbooks to foster the development of historical empathy. In their examination of historical empathy activities in Australian history textbooks, for example, Donnelly and Sharp (2020) similarly found that the generalized stereotype level of historical empathy was prominent among the activities in their sample. Furthermore, in analyzing these activities, Donnelly and Sharp also found that many students would be left to make unsubstantiated claims about historical perspectives, as the textbooks provided limited contextual information. The lack of contextual information in history textbooks is a recurring issue that is found in similar studies, such as those conducted by Yeager et al.

(1998), Lazarakou (2008), and Vogel (2020). In these inquiries, each author similarly

notes that the lack of contextual information in textbooks hinders student development

of historical empathy.

To prevent students from making stereotypical and unsubstantiated responses,

the previous literature on this topic suggests that the activities should be supplemented

with primary source materials that discuss a wide variety of perspectives surrounding the

correlating historical event (Donnelly & Sharp, 2020; Lazarakou, 2008, Morgan, 2015;

Vogel, 2020; Yeager et al., 1998). These studies argue that the use of primary source

materials that contain multiple perspectives will assist students in constructing justifiable

responses as they typically provide more contextual information for students to utilize.

Additionally, the use of primary source material is considered to be a "critical attribute

of any effort to foster historical empathy" (Endacott & Brooks, 2018, p. 213) due to its

ability to provide students with an idea of how historical figures thought and felt about

specific events or situations (Endacott & Brooks, 2018).

In the current study, students were provided with opportunities to use "primary

sources," but these opportunities were severely limited. Out of the 744 activities

collected for this study, for example, only 53 activities encourage students to interact

with historical sources. However, this frequency is further limited to 36 activities when

compared to the questions that encourage students to display the generalized stereotypes

level of historical empathy. Furthermore, among these 36 activities, the primary

purposes behind using the historical sources also varied. For example, in the current

study, two of the 36 questions were coded as requiring students to display low

complexity, first ordered substantive historical knowledge when the students were tasked with identifying or recalling "factual" information regarding a perspective contained within a historical source. As a result, these two activities encouraged students to interact with a historical source in less meaningful ways because they only required students to "understand" limited information associated with a historical perspective.

Additionally, out of the 36 generalized stereotypes questions that incorporated historical sources, only 32 activities utilized primary sources. The remaining four sources are either secondary accounts or literary works published years after the historical actors, perspectives, or events existed. Furthermore, among the activities that prompt students to utilize a primary source, none of the questions contain primary sources that represent multiple perspectives. Instead, every single one of the primary sources directly coordinates with a historical event to which the targeted historical perspective is associated. As a result, the primary sources connected with these questions seem to provide only small amounts of additional contextual information for students to utilize.

In addition to providing students with limited opportunities to utilize primary sources, the textbooks, and their correlating historical empathy activities, do not offer any student support for analyzing historical sources. Previous literature that utilizes primary sources to foster the development of historical empathy has noted that students often struggle to make sense of historical accounts (Endacott & Brooks, 2018; Wineburg, 2001). Wineburg (2001), for example, notes that when students read historical accounts they often bypass "source information", overlook subtle word

choices, and fail to adequately contextualize perspectives. As a result of these difficulties, students are likely to need support when reading and interacting with historical accounts (Wineburg, 2001), which unfortunately is not occurring among the textbooks within this sample.

Beyond the findings associated with the generalized stereotype level of historical empathy, the current study also found that higher levels of historical empathy, such as constructed historical empathy and restricted historical empathy, were seldom encouraged in the textbook activities. The constructed level of historical empathy is not required in any of the activities, while restricted historical empathy is only encouraged in 13 of the 744 questions. The restricted level of historical empathy occurs when students can accept that historical figures perceived their world differently than we do today, that historical evidence is needed to support an understanding of the historical figure's perspective, and that there are multiple perspectives associated with historical events, but they are unable to relate these perspectives to larger historical and social contexts that lay beyond the immediate historical situation (Ashby & Lee, 1987).

These findings align with previous research that explored the ability of textbooks to foster the development of historical empathy. In their examination of historical empathy activities in Australian textbooks, for example, Donnelly and Sharp (2020) similarly found that the restricted and constructed levels of historical empathy were seldomly encouraged among the activities in their sample. However, among their activities, Donnelly and Sharp were able to locate at least one prompt that encouraged students to display the highest level of historical empathy, constructed historical

81

empathy. Additionally, in the activities that required students to display restricted historical empathy, Donnelly and Sharp noted that students were commonly tasked with responding to source material provided in the textbook as part of the prompt. In the current study, the restricted historical empathy activities similarly task students to interact with historical sources, but they place the responsibility of locating and assembling sources on the students. The textbooks and their corresponding activities offer no support to students regarding how to gather and assess whether or not a source is relevant to answering the prompt.

Conclusions Related to Historical Knowledge and Skills Development

The results of the analysis, in terms of the second research question guiding this study, also reveal that students have few opportunities to learn and demonstrate historical knowledge if they engage with historical empathy textbook activities. Out of the 744 activities collected for this study, 653 required students to utilize first ordered, substantive historical knowledge to complete textbook activities designed to foster historical empathy. First ordered substantive historical knowledge consists of the "content knowledge" surrounding the various "narratives, arguments, and explanations about the past" (VanSledright, 2014, p.40). First ordered substantive knowledge, however, can be further broken down into knowledge that is more or less complex and subject-specific.

In this study, activities requiring students to recall or simply explain historical events were considered representative of VanSledright's (2014) low complexity, first ordered substantive historical knowledge. Out of the 744 activities collected for this

82

study, 335 questions were categorized as representing low complexity, first ordered substantive historical knowledge. Activities that tasked students to recall or explain information were considered "less complex" because students only had to repeat or "reformat" information about a historical event or figure.

Activities that required students to construct and defend arguments concerning a historical perspective or to apply content knowledge to other situations or concepts, however, were considered to be representative of VanSledright's higher complexity, first ordered substantive historical knowledge. In the current study, 318 activities were categorized as representing higher complexity, first ordered substantive historical knowledge. These activities were considered "more complex" because students had to move beyond the simple recalling or reformatting of information to answer the prompt.

These findings offer important considerations in light of theoretical literature outlining historical knowledge. VanSledright (2014), Wineburg (2001), and Seixas & Morton (2013) each indicate that historical knowledge is composed of two domains, content knowledge, and procedural concepts or skills. However, in the current study, content knowledge is the only domain of historical knowledge that is prioritized by the historical empathy textbook activities.

Furthermore, according to VanSledright's (2014) historical thinking and understanding framework, only portions of historical content knowledge are prioritized in the activities, as second-ordered substantive knowledge is rarely required. According to VanSledright, second-ordered substantive knowledge consists of the content knowledge organized by historical concepts such as decline and progress, change and

continuity, cause and effect, conflict and resolution, historical context, and historical significance (2014). In the current study, second ordered substantive knowledge is only required in 43 of the 744 activities.

Furthermore, among these 43 activities the primary purposes behind using second ordered substantive knowledge varied. For example, in the current study, 15 of the activities were coded as requiring students to display both second ordered historical knowledge and low complexity first ordered substantive knowledge. In these activities, students were tasked with recalling or restating content knowledge as it related to historical concepts such as cause and effect. As a result, these activities encouraged students to use second ordered substantive knowledge in less meaningful ways as they only required students to "identify", and not to "apply or "contextualize", conceptual information associated with a historical perspective.

Another domain of historical knowledge that is rarely encouraged in the historical empathy activities collected for this study is strategic knowledge. According to VanSledright (2014), strategic knowledge consists of the skills and processes historians utilize to "do history" or to process and understand substantive knowledge. In this study, only 53 of the activities required students to utilize strategic historical knowledge in order to answer the question prompts. Among these activities, the types of procedures or skills that students were required to perform consisted of assembling and analyzing sources. However, the opportunities to collect and analyze sources were limited as no support was provided for students to practice each skill. Furthermore, some of the

84

activities simply required students to read and recall information in the sources, instead of applying the knowledge to the perspectives associated with historical figures.

Implications & Recommendations for Teacher Historical Empathy Activity Use

This study revealed important findings about how 8th and 11th grade U.S. History textbooks, adopted for use in the State of Texas, foster historical empathy and historical knowledge through student engagement with textbook activities. This study concludes that if teachers should rely on historical empathy textbooks activities as opportunities for students to develop and practice both historical empathy and disciplinary knowledge and skills, their students will have few opportunities to do so. The textbook activities, collected for this study, predominantly encourage students to make generalized, stereotypical, and unsubstantiated responses regarding how historical figures "thought, felt, acted, made decisions, and faced consequences within their specific historical and social contexts" (Endacott & Brooks, 2013, p. 41). Furthermore, the activities also predominantly require students to utilize only portions of historical knowledge as second ordered substantive knowledge and strategic historical knowledge are seldom encouraged for students to employ.

As a result of these findings, it is recommended that teachers approach these activities with caution as they are unlikely to help students achieve larger goals that extend beyond the prompts, such as preparing for life in a culturally diverse democratic society. The study of history and historical empathy can help prepare students for life within diverse democratic societies if students have multiple opportunities to gather information, analyze multiple historical perspectives, and make evidence-based

arguments. Practicing how to gather information, analyze multiple historical perspectives, and make evidence-based arguments helps students develop the skills needed to evaluate the perspectives and arguments surrounding social issues the students may encounter in their everyday lives (Saye & Brush, 2004; VanSledright, 2004). Furthermore, the development of historical empathy is also crucial for students preparing for civic competency because the information and experiences gained from empathizing with past perspectives can contribute toward student development of knowledge and tolerance of social events, issues, and viewpoints (Ashby & Lee, 1987; Barton & Levstik, 2004; Kohlmeier, 2006; Endacott, 2014).

However, should teachers decide to engage their students in historical empathy textbook activities, it is recommended that the activities be modified in order to help students better develop both historical empathy and historical knowledge. One way that these activities could be modified is by providing students with supplementary primary and secondary sources that represent multiple perspectives, as textbooks often lack enough contextual information upon which students can pull from to inform their responses. Yeager et al., (1998) found that students who were provided with multiple historical accounts related to President Truman's decision to drop the atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, Japan, were able to "offer multiple, interconnected reasons for Truman's decisions" and frequently incorporated evidence from the sources to support their responses (p. 3). Therefore, the use of supplementary primary and secondary sources is likely to assist students in developing deeper understandings of the historical perspectives under investigation.

Although supplementing the textbook activities with multiple primary and secondary sources might assist students in developing historical empathy and historical knowledge, students often struggle with comprehending historical accounts (Afflerbach & VanSledright, 2001; Barton & Levstik, 2004, Endacott & Brooks, 2018; Wineburg, 1991, 1999, 2001). As a result, teachers should be prepared to offer support to students regarding historical accounts, as they often bypass "source information", overlook subtle word choices, and fail to adequately contextualize perspectives (Wineburg, 1991, 1999, 2001).

Another way in which the activities could be modified to help students better develop and practice both historical empathy and historical knowledge is by rewriting the prompts (Donnelly & Sharp, 2020). In the current study, many of the questions are not written in a way to encourage students to display higher levels of historical empathy, such as constructed historical empathy (Ashby and Lee's, 1987). Instead, many of the questions encourage students to make generalized, stereotypical, and unsubstantiated claims about the perspectives of historical figures. Furthermore, the textbook activities that manage to encourage students to display the second highest level of historical empathy, restricted historical empathy, deliberately encourage students to understand historical perspectives as they relate to limited historical and social contexts. As a result, teachers could rewrite the textbook activities in order to encourage students to display constructed historical empathy. Constructed historical empathy prompts are those that encourage students to accept that historical figures perceived their world differently, that historical evidence is needed to support their understandings the perspectives, that there

are multiple perspectives associated with historical events, and that the perspectives should be contextualized within larger historical and social contexts in order to fully conceptualize why the historical figures acted in certain ways or believed in what they did (Ashby & Lee, 1987).

Further Research

Although the current study expands upon existing research concerning the development of historical empathy and historical knowledge through student engagement with textbooks, additional research on this topic is needed. Understanding how textbooks cultivate historical empathy and historical knowledge is essential as textbooks remain one of the most widely used curricular resources to instruct students about the subject of history (Lucy, Demszky, Bromley, & Jurafsky, 2020). A direct extension of the current study that future research might pursue is examining how history textbooks, outside of those adopted for use in the State of Texas, attempt to foster historical empathy and knowledge. The findings in the current study are restricted to textbooks adopted by the State of Texas and, therefore, are not likely to describe how historical empathy and knowledge are fostered in textbooks adopted by different states across the United States of America.

Furthermore, future research could also examine how historical empathy and knowledge are cultivated in textbooks intended for different grade levels or subjects. The findings in the current study are restricted to textbooks that are specifically intended for 8th or 11th-grade U.S. History courses. As a result, future research could extend the current study by examining how historical empathy and historical knowledge are

fostered in textbooks designed for elementary grade levels or different secondary grade levels, or different "subjects of history" such as "World History" or local state histories.

Further research might also examine textbooks that are used by students and teachers, where the teacher teaches more than one subject. Teachers who teach more than one subject, may not necessarily be considered "content experts", and therefore, may need additional support in assisting students with the development of historical empathy and knowledge required by the textbook activities.

Another option for extension might include researching how different textbook editions foster the development of historical empathy and knowledge Editions that future researchers might examine include digital or teacher edition textbooks. The current study only analyzed student edition textbooks, so it is unknown how other editions attempt to cultivate historical knowledge and skills. In their 2020 study, Donnelly and Sharp provide a glimpse into how digital textbook activities could foster historical empathy, but their findings are restricted to one activity. Nonetheless, their findings are significant as this particular activity represented the only prompt in their study that represented the highest level of historical empathy on Ashby and Lee's (1987) five levels of historical empathy framework, constructed historical empathy. As a result, examining how digital textbook editions foster the development of historical empathy and knowledge might be interesting, especially if there are no "page number restrictions" like there are with print edition textbooks.

Finally, an extension of this study might also examine the text complexity of the textbook activities and their associated materials. If the textbook activities are too

complex for their targeted student populations to understand, then the development of

historical empathy through these tasks is inaccessible. Furthermore, understanding the

complexity of the activities additionally helps teachers make better informed curricular

and instructional decisions related to the implementation of these activities in their

classrooms.

REFERENCES

Afflerbach, P., & VanSledright, B. (2001). Hath! doth! What?: Middle graders reading

   innovative history text. Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 44(8), 696-707.

Apple, M. W., & Christian-Smith, L. K. (1991). The politics of the textbook. In M. W.

   Apple, & L. K. Christian-Smith, (Eds.), *The politics of the textbook* (pp.9-49).

   Routledge.

Ashby, R., & Lee, P. (1987). Children's concepts of empathy and understanding in

   history. In C. Portal (Eds.), *The history curriculum for teachers* (pp.62-88). The

   Flamer Press.

Ashby, R., & Lee, P. (2001). Empathy, perspective taking, and rational

   understanding. In O.L. Davis, E. Yeager, & S. Foster (Eds.), *Historical Empathy*

   and perspective taking in the social studies (pp. 21-50). Rowman and Littlefield.

Bartlett, I., Fenton, E., Fowler, D., & Mandelbaum, S. (1969). *A New History of the*

   United States: An Inquiry Approach. Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, Inc.

Barton, K., & Levstik, L. (2004). *Teaching history for the common good*. Lawrence

   Erlbaum Associates.

Biggs, J., & Tang, C. (2007). *Teaching for quality learning at university (3ʳᵈ ed)*. Open

   University Press.

Boyer, P., & Stucky, S. (2003). *The American Nation in the Modern Era.* Holt, Rinehart

   & Winston.

Brooks, S. (2008). Displaying historical empathy: What impact can a writing assignment

   have? *Social Studies: Research and Practice*, 3(2), 130-146.

Brooks, S. (2009). Historical empathy in the social studies classroom: A review of the literature. *The Journal of Social Studies Research*, 33(2), 213-234.

Brooks, S. (2010). *An examination of the fostering and display of historical empathy in one secondary social studies classroom*. (Order no. 3435981) [Doctoral dissertation, University of Virginia] ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global.

Brooks, S. (2011). Historical empathy as perspective recognition and care in one secondary social studies classroom. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, 39(2), 166-202.

Brophy, J., & Alleman, J. (1991). Activities as instructional tools: A framework for analysis and evaluation. *Educational Researcher*, 20 (4), 9-23.

Brown-Buchanan, L. (2012). *Using film to think historically about the Civil Rights Movement with elementary preservice teachers*. (Order no. 3511024) [Doctoral dissertation, The University of North Carolina at Greensboro] ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global.

Cambridge Dictionary. (n.d). Divvy. In *cambridge dictionary*. Retrieved April 16, 2022, from https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/divvy

Colbert-Lewis, S. C. D. (2005). *An analysis of the presentation of women in five high school world history textbooks*. (Order no. 3177505) [Doctoral dissertation, University of Virginia] ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global.

D'Adamo, L., & Fallace, T. (2011). The multigenre research project: An approach to developing historical empathy. *Social Studies Research and Practice*, 6(1), 75-88.

Danzer, G. A., Klor de Alva, J. J., Krieger, L. S., Wilson, L. E., & Woloch, N. (2016). *The Americans: United States History Since 1877* (Texas Edition). Houghton, Mifflin, & Harcourt.

Davis, O. L., Jr. (2001). In pursuit of historical empathy. In O.L. Davis, E. Yeager, & S. Foster (Eds.), *Historical Empathy and perspective taking in the social studies* (pp. 1-12). Rowman and Littlefield.

Decety, J., & Jackson, P. L. (2006). A social-neuroscience perspective on empathy. Current Directions in Psychological Science, 15(2), 54-58. doi:10.1111/j.0963-7214.2006.00406.x

DiBacco, T. V., Mason, L. C., & Appy, C. G. (1992). *History of The United States, Volume 2: Civil War to the Present*. Houghton Mifflin Company.

Donnelly, D., & Sharp, H. (2020). Student learning activities in Australian History textbooks: An assessment tool to examine historical empathy and cognitive domains. *Historical Encounters: A Journal of Historical Consciousness*, 7(3), 92-106. https://hej.hermes-history.net/index.php/HEJ/article/view/195

Doppen, F. H. (2000). Teaching and learning multiple perspectives: The atomic bomb. The Social Studies, 91(4), 159-169.

Elo, S., & Kyngäs, H. (2007). The qualitative content analysis. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 62(1), 107-115. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2648.2007.04569.x

Elo, S., Kääriäinen, M., Kanste, O., Pölkki, T., Utrianen, K., & Kyngäs, H. (2014). Qualitative content analysis: A focus on trustworthiness. SAGE Open, 4(1), 1-10. https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244014522633

Endacott, J. L. (2010). Reconsidering affective engagement in historical empathy.

Theory & Research in Social Education, 38(1), 6-49.

Endacott, J. L. (2014). Negotiating the process of historical empathy. *Theory &*

Research in Social Education, 42(1), 4-34.

https://doi.org/10.1080/00933104.2013.826158

Endacott, J. L., & Brooks, S. (2013). An updated theoretical and practical model for

promoting historical empathy. *Social Studies Research and Practice*, 8(1), 41-58.

Endacott, J. L., & Brooks, S. (2018). Historical empathy: Perspectives and responding to

the past. In S. A. Metzger & L. McArthur Harris (Eds.), *The Wiley international*

handbook of history teaching and learning (pp.203-226) Wiley-Blackwell.

Endacott, J. L., & Sturtz, J. (2015). Historical empathy and pedagogical reasoning. *The*

Journal of Social Studies Research, 39(1), 1-16.

Foster, S. (1999). Using historical empathy to excite students about the study of history:

Can you empathize with Neville Chamberlain?. *The Social Studies*, 90(1), 18-24.

Foster, S. (2001). Historical empathy in theory and practice: Some final thoughts. In

O.L. Davis, E. Yeager, & S. Foster (Eds.), *Historical Empathy and perspective*

taking in the social studies (pp. 167-82). Rowman and Littlefield.

Foster, S., Morris, J. W., & Davis, O.L. (1996). Prospects for teaching historical analysis

and interpretation: National curriculum standards for history meet current history

textbooks. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 11(4), 367-385.

Foster, S., & Yeager, E.A. (1998). The role of empathy in the development of historical

understanding. *International Journal of Social Education*, 13(1), 1-7.

Frankel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. (2015). How to design and evaluate

    Research in Education (9th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.

Gall, J. P., Gall, M. D., & Borg, W. R. (2005). *Applying education research: A practical*

    guide. Pearson.

Garraty, J. A., & Bacon, P. (1992). *The Story of America: Beginnings to 1877.* Holt,

    Rinehart, & Winston, Inc.

Garraty, J. A., & Bacon, P. (1992). *The Story of America, Volume 2: 1865 To The*

    Present. Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, Inc.

Graff, H.F. (1986). *America The Glorious Republic Volume I: Beginnings to 1877.*

    Houghton Mifflin Company.

Graff, H.F., & Roberts, S.A. (1986). *America The Glorious Republic Volume 2: 1877 To*

    The Present. Houghton Mifflin Company.

Houghton, Mifflin, and Harcourt. (2016). *United States History: Early Colonial Period*

    Through Reconstruction. Houghton, Mifflin, & Harcourt.

Hsieh, H. F., & Shannon, S. E. (2005). Three approaches to qualitative content analysis.

    Qualitative Health Research, 15(9), 1277-1288.

    https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732305276687

Jensen, J. (2008). Developing historical empathy through debate: An action research

    study. *Social Studies Research and Practice*, 3(1), 55-67.

Kohlmeier, J. (2006). "Couldn't she just leave?": The relationship between consistently

    using class discussions and the development of historical empathy in a 9th grade

world history course. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, 34(1), 34-57.

   https://doi.org/10.1080/00933104.2006.10473297

Korin, D. R. (2008). *Comprehension strategies explicated in three eighth grade social studies textbook.* (Order no. 3343471) [Doctoral dissertation, Rutgers The State University of New Jersey] ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global.

Kownslar, A. O., & Frizzle, D. B. (1970). *Discovering American History.* Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, Inc.

Lavere, D. B. (2008). The quality of pedagogical exercises in U.S. history textbooks. *The Social Studies*, 99(1), 3-8. https://doi.org/10.3200/TSSS.99.1.3-8

Lazarakou, E.D. (2008). Empathy as a tool for historical understanding: An evaluative approach of the ancient Greek primary history. *International Journal of Social Education*, 23(1), 27-50.

Levstik, L. S., & Barton, K. C. (2015). *Doing history: Investigating with children in elementary and middle schools* (5th ed.). Routledge.

Levstik, L. S., & Barton, K. C. (in press). *Doing history: Investigating with children in elementary and middle schools* (6th ed.). Routledge.

Lowen, J. W. (2018). *Lies my teacher told me: Everything your American history textbook got wrong* (2nd ed.). The New Press.

Lucy, L., Demszky, D., Bromley, P., & Jurafsky, D. (2020). Content analysis of textbooks via natural language processing: Findings on gender, race, and ethnicity in Texas U.S. History Textbooks. *AERA Open*, 6(3), 1-27.

   https://doi.org/10.1177/2332858420940312

Mason, L. C., Jacobs, W. J., & Ludlum, R. P. (1992) *History of The United States, Volume 1: Beginnings to 1877*. Houghton Mifflin Company.

Miles M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook*. Sage.

Morgan, K. E. (2015). Learning empathy through school history textbooks?: A case study. *Rethinking History*, 19(3), 370-392.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2019a). Table 203.72: Public elementary and secondary school enrollment, by local and state: Fall 2018. In U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics (Ed.), *Digest of education statistics* (2019 ed.).

https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d20/tables/dt20_203.72.asp

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation* (3rd ed.). Sage Publications.

Pearcy, M. (2019). "We are not enemies": An analysis of textbooks depictions of Fort Sumter and the beginning of the Civil War. *History Teacher*, 52(4), 595-614.

Risjord, N. K., & Haywoode, T. L. (1979). *A History of The United States from 1877*. Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Risjord, N. K., & Haywoode, T. L. (1979). *A History Of The United States To 1877*. Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Roberts, C. E. (2019). Understanding historical empathy through the dialogue of elementary students: A qualitative research study. (Order no. 27790361) [Doctoral dissertation, North Carolina State University] ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global.

Saye, J. W., & Brush, T. A. (2004). Promoting civic competence through problem-based

  history learning environments. In G. E. Hamot, & J. J. Patrick (Eds.) *Civic*

  learning in teacher education. ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies/Social

  Science Education

Seawall, G. T. (2000). *History textbooks at the new century: A report of the American*

  Textbook Council. American Textbook Council.

  https://www.historytextbooks.net/ED441731.pdf

Seixas, P., & Morton, T. (2013). *The big six: Historical thinking concepts*. Nelson

  Education.

Schreier, M. (2012). *Qualitative content analysis in practice*. SAGE Publications Ltd.

Stanford, O. R. (2015). *"World War II-turning points" shifts in U.S. History textbooks:*

  A content analysis. (Order no. 10042440) [Doctoral dissertation, Seattle Pacific

  University] ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global.

Stucky, S., & Salvucci, L. K. (2003). *Call to Freedom: Beginnings to 1877* (Texas

  Edition). Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Texas Education Agency. (2018). *Texas essential knowledge and skills for social studies*

  (5th grade).

  https://texreg.sos.state.tx.us/public/readtac$ext.TacPage?sl=R&app=9&p_dir=&

  p_rloc=&p_tloc=&p_ploc=&pg=1&p_tac=&ti=19&pt=2&ch=113&rl=16

Texas Education Agency. (2019). *STAAR social studies resources.*

  https://tea.texas.gov/student-assessment/testing/staar/staar-social-studies-

  resources

Texas Education Agency. (2021). Enrollment in Texas public schools, 2020-2021

    (Document No. GE21 601 08). Texas Education Agency.

    https://tea.texas.gov/sites/default/files/enroll-2020-21.pdf

Todd, L. P., & Curti, M. (1968). *Rise of The American Nation, Volume One: From The*

    Beginnings to 1865. Harcourt, Brace, & World, Inc.

Todd, L. P., & Curti, M. (1968). *Rise of The American Nation, Volume Two.* Harcourt,

    Brace, & World, Inc.

Todd, L. P., & Curti, M. (1972). *Rise of American Nation Volume Two: 1865 To The*

    Present. Harcourt, Brace, & World, Inc.

Todd, L. P., & Curti, M. (1977). Rise of The American Nation, Heritage Edition,

    Volume 1: The Beginnings To 1865. Harcourt, Brace, & Jovanovich.

Todd, L. P., & Curti, M. (1977). *Rise Of The American Nation, Heritage Edition,*

    Volume 2: 1865 To The Present. Harcourt, Brace, & Jovanovich.

Todd, L. P., & Curti, M. (1986). *The American Nation: Reconstruction To The Present,*

    HBJ American History Series. Harcourt, Brace, & Jovanovich.

Uppin, H., & Timoistsuk, I. (2019). We'll be back by Christmas: Developing historical

    empathy during a museum activity. *Journal of Museum Education*, 44(3), 310-

    324.

Vanderhook, C. A. (2020). *The type of questions being promoted in 10th grade social*

    studies textbooks. (Order no. 27829070) [Doctoral dissertation, Seton Hall

    University] ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global.

VanSledright, B. (2001). Empathy, perspective taking, and rational understanding. In

  O.L. Davis, E. Yeager, & S. Foster (Eds.), *Historical Empathy and perspective*

  taking in the social studies (pp. 1-12). Rowman and Littlefield.

VanSledright, B. (2004). What does it mean to think historically...and how do you teach

  it?. *Social Education*, 68(3), 230-233.

VanSledright, B. (2014). *Assessing historical thinking and understanding: Innovative*

  designs for new standards. Routledge.

Vogel, J. (2020). "Imagine you are…": Historical empathy and perspectives in history

  textbook tasks. *Agora*, 55(2), 64-75.

Wood, L. C., Gabriel, R. H., & Biller, E. L. (1986). The American Nation Beginnings

  Through Reconstruction, HBJ American History Series, (Annotated Teacher's

  Edition). Harcourt, Brace, & Jovanovich.

Wilder, H. B., Ludlum, R. P., & Brown, H. M., Anderson, H.R. (1970). *This is*

  America's Story (Third Edition). Houghton Mifflin Company.

Wineburg, S. (1991). On the reading of historical texts: Notes on the breach between

  school and the academy. American Education Research Journal, 28(3), 495-519.

Wineburg, S. (1999). Historical thinking and other unnatural acts. *Phi Delta Kappan*,

  80(7), 488

Wineburg, S. (2001). *Historical thinking and other unnatural acts: Charting the future*

  of teaching the past. Temple University Press.

Yeager, E. A., Foster, S. J., Maley, S. D., Anderson, T., & Morris, J. W. III (1998). Why

  people in the past acted as they did: An exploratory study in historical empathy.

  International Journal of Social Education, 13(1), 8-24.

Yilmaz, K. (2007). Historical empathy and its implication for classroom practices in

  schools, *The History Teacher*, 40(3), 331-337.

APPENDIX A

Table A1

Textbook Sample for 8ᵗʰ Grade U.S. History

Title:	Copyright:	Adoption Cycle:	Grade:	Publisher:	Authors:
This is America's Story Third Edition	1970	1970-1972	8	Houghton Mifflin Company	Wilder, H. B., Ludlum, R. P., Brown, H. M., & Anderson, H.R.
Discovering American History	1970	1970-1972	8	Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, Inc.	Kownslar, A. O., & Frizzle, D.B.
Rise of The American Nation, Volume One: From The Beginnings to 1865	1968	1973-1978	8	Harcourt, Brace, & World, Inc.	Todd, L. P., & Curti, M.
A History Of The United States To 1877	1979	1979-1985	8	Holt, Rinehart & Winston	Risjord, N. K., & Haywoode, T. L.
Rise of The American Nation, Heritage Edition, Volume 1: The Beginnings To 1865	1977	1979-1985	8	Harcourt, Brace, & Jovanovich	Todd, L. P., & Curti, M.
America The Glorious Republic Volume I: Beginnings to 1877	1986	1986-1991	8	Houghton Mifflin Company	Graff, H.F.
The American Nation Beginnings Through Reconstruction, HBJ American History Series, Annotated Teacher's Edition	1986	1986-1991	8	Harcourt, Brace, & Jovanovich	Wood, L. C., Gabriel, R. H., & Biller, E. L.
The Story of America: Beginnings to 1877	1992	1992-2002	8	Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc.	Garraty, J. A., & Bacon, P.
History of The United States, Volume 1: Beginnings to 1877	1992	1992-2002	8	Houghton Mifflin Company	Mason, L. C., Jacobs, W. J., & Ludlum, R. P.
Call to Freedom: Beginnings to 1877 - Texas Edition	2003	2003-2014	8	Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc.	Stucky, S., & Salvucci, L. K.
United States History: Early Colonial Period Through Reconstruction	2016	2015-2023	8	Houghton, Mifflin, and Harcourt	Houghton, Mifflin, and Harcourt

APPENDIX A

Table A2

Textbook Sample for 11ᵗʰ Grade U.S. History

Title:	Copyright:	Adoption Cycle:	Grade:	Publisher:	Authors:
A New History of the United States: An Inquiry Approach	1969	1970-1972	11	Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, Inc.	Bartlett, I., Fenton, E., Fowler, D., & Mandelbaum, S.
Rise of American Nation Volume Two: 1865 To The Present	1972	1973-1978	11	Harcourt, Brace, & World, Inc.	Todd, L. P., & Curti, M.
A History of The United States from 1877	1979	1979-1985	11	Holt, Rinehart & Winston	Risjord, N. K., & Haywoode, T. L.
Rise Of The American Nation, Heritage Edition, Volume 2: 1865 To The Presen	1977	1979-1985	11	Harcourt, Brace, & Jovanovich	Todd, L. P., & Curti, M.
America The Glorious Republic Volume 2: 1877 To The Present	1986	1986-1991	11	Houghton Mifflin Company	Graff, H.F., & Roberts, S.A.
The American Nation: Reconstruction To The Present, HBJ American History Series	1986	1986-1991	11	Harcourt, Brace, & Jovanovich	Todd, L. P., & Curti, M.
The Story of America, Volume 2: 1865 To The Present	1992	1992-2002	11	Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc.	Garraty, J. A., & Bacon, P.
History of The United States, Volume 2: Civil War to the Present	1992	1992-2002	11	Houghton Mifflin Company	DiBacco, T. V., Mason, L. C., & Appy, C. G.
The American Nation in the Modern Era	2003	2003-2014	11	Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc.	Boyer, P., & Stucky, S.
The Americans: United States History Since 1877, Texas Edition	2016	2015-2023	11	Houghton, Mifflin, and Harcourt	Danzer, G.A., Klor de Alva, J.J., Krieger, L.S., Wilson, L.E., & Woloch, N.